

THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I have a copy of the third report of the committee upon the duty of courts to refuse to execute statutes in contravention of the fundamental law, presented at the fortieth annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association held at Brooklyn, N. Y., on the 12th and 13th of January, 1917. I ask that the paper be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to its being printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on February 14, 1917, approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3681. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Esparta*;

S. 5985. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to cause the steamship *Republie* to be enrolled and licensed as a vessel of the United States;

S. 7779. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William A. Reiss*;

S. 7780. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to *Clemens A. Reiss*;

S. 7781. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss*;

S. 7782. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss*; and

S. 7963. An act to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, some days ago the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] gave notice that on Saturday, the 17th day of February, 1917, immediately after the routine morning business, he would ask the Senate to consider resolutions in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of the late Senator BENJAMIN F. SHIVELY, of Indiana; the late Senator EDWIN C. BURLEIGH, of Maine; and of the late Senator JAMES P. CLARKE, of Arkansas. A conference has been held by Senators from the States of Indiana, Maine, and Arkansas, and, at the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and other Senators, and for the convenience of Senators I submit a request for unanimous consent, as follows:

That the Senate convene on Sunday, February 18, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m., to consider resolutions in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of the late Senator BENJAMIN F. SHIVELY, of Indiana; the late Senator EDWIN C. BURLEIGH, of Maine; and the late Senator JAMES P. CLARKE, of Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BECKHAM in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS.

Mr. BRYAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m., Thursday, February 15, 1917), the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 16, 1917, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 15, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Heavenly Father, with profound gratitude for all the blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us as individuals and as a Nation in the past, and with a firm reliance upon Thee to uphold, sustain, and guide us in the future, we would take up the burdens of life anew and under Thee go forward to greater achievements. Hear us and thus bless us through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RAILWAYS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill (H. R. 20907) to amend an act providing mediation, conciliation, and so forth, approved July 15, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The subject matter of this bill relates to controversies between railways and their employees. All legislation on this subject having been referred

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that committee having reported a bill on the same, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of that bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 19937) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war and to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks to take from the Speaker's table a bill which the Clerk will report by title, and disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, and Mr. LANGLEY.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION (H. REPT. NO. 1493, PT. 2).

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to file the views of the minority in connection with the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks leave to file the views of the minority on a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REFUND OF CERTAIN DUTIES.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is House joint resolution 335—

Mr. CAPSTICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 9288 be taken from the Speaker's table and that the Senate amendment be agreed to by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman when we get through with the unfinished business.

Mr. MANN. This takes precedence over the unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9288, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9288) providing for the refund of certain duties illegally levied and collected on acetate of lime.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

In line 7 strike out the words "and interest."

Mr. CAPSTICK. I move to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment was concurred in.

On motion of Mr. CAPSTICK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

MANAGERS OF THE NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution, which is the unfinished business.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 335) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in an amendment to this joint resolution appears the name George W. Black as a substitute for Guy T. HELVERING. That was a mistake. It should have been George Black. There is no "W" in his name, and I ask unanimous consent that that change be made, striking out the surplusage.

Mr. MANN. The amendment is still pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks to strike out the middle initial "W," leaving the name George Black. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute in the desk copy of the joint resolution, in line 10, the name of Thomas S. Bridgham.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] was offering is what the gentleman from North Carolina refers to. It was amended by substituting the name of George Black in place of Mr. Findlay. His amendment further provided for substituting the name of John W. West in line 10 for Thomas S. Bridgham. Now the gentleman asks unanimous consent that that part of the amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will that make it Thomas S. Bridgham instead of John W. West? I do not recall exactly—

Mr. MANN. A part of the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] was to strike out the name of Thomas S. Bridgham in line 10 and to insert the name of John W. West. That part of the amendment is withdrawn, which leaves it Thomas S. Bridgham.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is what should be done. It was an error.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The question is on the remaining amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution as amended.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHALENBARGER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ARKANSAS RIVER, ARK.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have laid before the House the bill (S. 8105) granting the consent of Congress to the Conway County Bridge District to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Arkansas River, in the State of Arkansas, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill S. 8105.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Conway County Bridge District, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Arkansas, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or between fractional southwest section 29, township 6 north, range 16 west of the fifth principal meridian, and fractional northeast section 31, township 6 north, range 16 west of the fifth principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 20535) was laid on the table.

PENALTY FOR FALSE REPRESENTATIONS IN RELATION TO PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Speaker lay before the House the bill S. 5899, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 5899) to punish persons who make false representations to settlers and others pertaining to the public lands of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will request that when gentlemen have matters to be disposed of in a summary way they notify the Clerk in advance because of the great number of matters on the Speaker's table. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, for a reward paid or promised to him in that behalf, shall undertake to locate for an intending purchaser, settler, or entryman any public lands of the United States subject to disposition under the public-land laws, and who shall willfully, and falsely represent to such intending purchaser, settler, or entryman that any tract of land shown to him is public land of the United States subject to sale, settlement, or entry, or that it is of a particular surveyed description, with intent to deceive the person to whom such representation is made, or who, in reckless disregard of the truth, shall falsely represent to any such person that any tract of land shown to him is public land of the United States subject to sale, settlement, or entry, or that it is of a particular surveyed description, thereby deceiving the person to whom such representation is made, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$300 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RAKER, a motion to reconsider the motion whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 15323, was laid on the table.

SALE OF FEDERAL BUILDING SITE, HONOLULU, HAWAII.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Speaker lay before the House the bill (S. 7872) for the ratification of the sale of a Federal building site in Hawaii, there being a similar bill on the calendar. There is one small amendment that I want to offer.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 7872) to confirm and ratify the sale of the Federal building site at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sale of the Federal building site at Honolulu, in the Territory of Hawaii, made under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat., p. 892), to Castle & Cooke (Ltd.), a corporation, be, and the same is hereby, ratified and confirmed; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to convey said property, by usual quitclaim deed, to said Castle & Cooke (Ltd.), a corporation, the highest bidder for and purchaser of said property at said sale.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, before and after the word "Limited," in lines 7 and 10, there is a parenthesis. It should be "Castle & Cooke, Limited," without the parentheses, and I move to strike out the parentheses.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, is not this bill on the Union Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. BURNETT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. There can be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amend, in lines 7 and 10, by striking out the parentheses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURNETT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 19686) was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 20040 was referred to the Committee on Arid Lands. The chairman of the committee thinks that the bill should go to the Committee on Public Lands, and I ask that the reference be changed.

The SPEAKER. What is it about?

Mr. SEARS. It is allowing a right of way across public lands for the purpose of digging canals for drainage.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the letter of the Department of the Interior on this bill be printed as a House document. It is a very important matter to the people of my State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the letter of the Department of the Interior on this subject be printed as a House document. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 7757. An act authorizing a further extension of time to purchasers of land in the former Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservation, Okla., within which to make payment; and

S. 5672. An act for the relief of sundry building and loan associations.

PRINTING DIGEST OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES (H. DOC. NO. 2052).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House concurrent resolution No. 70 providing for the printing of a digest of contested-election cases and concur in the Senate amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER laid before the House concurrent resolution No. 70.

The Senate amendments were read.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to 20 minutes to address the House.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half an hour, if necessary. I do that because I anticipate the possibility of interruptions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for half an hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 13, 1917, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] made a speech in which he intimated that a newspaper conspiracy exists, organized for the purpose of misleading the people of the United States as to our international relations and as to the cause of the European war. What his evidence may be I do not know, but undoubtedly he will present it at the investigation which he tells us he will demand. I doubt whether the people of this country are of the opinion that the German side of the war has been insufficiently and unfairly presented in the press of the country. Personally I believe that Germany has had a fairer show than Great Britain. I do not say that the German side of the question has had in our press a fairer presentation than that of the allies, but I think that Germany herself has had a fairer show than Great Britain. Prof. Henry Van Dyke has been our minister at The Hague all through the war until recently, when he returned home to the United States. Prof. Van Dyke did not derive his knowledge of the course of the European war from American newspapers. He formed his opinions on the spot, almost within sound of the guns. Yet he has written the fiercest indictment of Germany which I have seen in the public press. But, Mr. Speaker, the American people are not going to base their opinions of the European war on the biased statement of either side. That is not our way. There are certain facts which stand out so clearly that no man can dispute them, and on those facts the American people will make up their minds and on them history will base its verdict.

There are certain things which each one of us knows. We know that when the war broke out Germany was ready to the last buckle both on land and at sea. We know that France and Russia were only half ready, and in the matter of ammunition entirely unready for war. We know that Great Britain had practically no army and even less equipment, but that she was admirably prepared at sea, as she always has been for the last 100 years, and as an island empire she must be if she wishes to make sure of her food supply. We know that Germany's original White Book attributed the outbreak of the war to Russia and that only subsequently did she accuse Great Britain. These facts, at all events, we have to guide us in our search for the nation guilty of instigating the war.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a matter of information?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has just stated the facts were indisputable that Germany was overwhelmingly prepared for war, and that the allies were insufficiently unprepared. Will the gentleman please tell us how it could be that a nation so overwhelmingly prepared was defeated at the battle of the Marne and driven back a long number of miles by a nation wholly unprepared?

Mr. GARDNER. I said that France was half prepared. According to Belloc, the reason why Germany was defeated in the battle of the Marne was this: In order to meet a movement of the Sixth French Army around their right flank the Germans weakened their center and the French under Gen. Foch broke through. The battle was won because of the worst military mistake which German strategy has made since before the days of Frederick the Great.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman—

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, if the gentleman will please not make me show my ignorance in a military discussion. These facts, at all events, we have to guide us in forming our judgment as to which nation was responsible for the outbreak of the war. Whichever nation was responsible, it has probably brought more misery upon the human race than has been caused by all the European wars for the last 300 years put together. Such is the heavy burden of responsibility which must be borne by some one, and Americans who have read the evidence know well who ought to bear it.

We know that Germany intentionally violated the treaty by which Belgium's neutrality was guaranteed. We know that fact by her own statement. We know that Germany treated Belgium, and continues to treat Belgium, with unheard-of barbarity—"frightfulness," as it is called in the German war vocabulary. We know that Germany has repeatedly torpedoed and shelled defenseless noncombatants, while Great Britain has been seriously accused of only one act of ruthlessness at sea—the Baralong murder, as the Germans call it. I am obliged to admit that I have not been altogether satisfied with Great Britain's defense in the case of the Baralong.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I just wish to ask the gentleman about Great Britain's treatment of Greece.

Mr. GARDNER. The allies were invited into Greece by Venizelos, who was then prime minister. They have murdered no women and children in Greece. The sympathies of the Greek people are overwhelmingly with the allies. I have many Greeks in my district, and I have yet to hear of one of them who takes the part of Germany and the central European powers. There is not a Greek in the United States who fails to know that the only reason why Greece, under Venizelos, did not join the allies was because it was forcibly restrained from so doing by King Constantine, the brother-in-law of the Kaiser.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. I received a telegram signed by a great many Greeks in my city protesting the interference of the allies with the people of Greece, so that there are some Greeks here—

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I know those telegrams can be gotten up anywhere, but I can testify, and so can the gentleman, if he knows anything about their rank and file, that Greeks in America side with the allies.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. GARDNER. I prefer to go ahead at present.

We know that in this war both sides have resorted to the use of poisonous gases and the bombing of cities from aircraft, practices which seem to us indefensible. In each instance we know that the allies followed Germany's example. We know that Germany has torn from their homes in Belgium and in northern France peaceful citizens, and has subjected them to a new form of slavery, against which the civilized world protests. All those things we know, whether our news is drawn from pro-ally newspapers, like the New York Herald and the New York Sun, or from pro-German newspapers, like the New York American and the New York Evening Mail. Furthermore, we know that on February 10, 1915, President Wilson warned Germany that we should hold that nation to "strict accountability" if in her submarine warfare she destroyed American lives or American ships. We know that on May 7, 1915, a German submarine torpedoed the *Lusitania* and that more than 100 American lives were destroyed. We know that for almost a year subsequent to the destruction of the *Lusitania* communications were exchanged between our Government and the German Government, and that meanwhile Germany continued to maintain and to some extent, at least, to practice her asserted right to torpedo merchantmen without warning. We know that after the *Sussex* was torpedoed President Wilson on April 18, 1916, informed Germany that we should break off relations with her unless assurances were given us that no more vessels would be torpedoed without warning. We know that Germany gave President Wilson the required promise, but reserved the right to recall this pledge. We know that except in a few debatable instances Germany substantially kept her promise, so far as American interests were concerned, until January 31, 1917, when she withdrew her restrictions on submarine warfare. Thereupon President Wilson broke off all relations with Germany on February 3, 1917, and informed the world that if the German threats were fulfilled he should come before Congress and ask us to authorize the use of the armed forces of the United States to protect our people in their rights. There the situation rests, but there it can not continue to rest, for it has speedily become apparent that American merchant ships are unwilling to face the terror of German submarine warfare unless they are furnished with some means of defense. I for one believe that it is the duty of our Government to see that our merchantmen are armed to defend themselves or are convoyed through the danger zone.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield? We gave the gentleman 30 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. All right.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman just expressed his opinion of what the United States ought to do with reference to protecting its commerce?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Now, I would like to know of the gentleman if he will maintain that position if the President actually does it?

Mr. GARDNER. Of course I shall.

Mr. CALDWELL. All right.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield before he goes further?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I am personally anxious to know whether in our reading the news—we are reading dispatches that are not censored—we are justified in believing that the facts are as we

read them in the press? In other words, getting to Mr. Moore's charge as to the accuracy of these press dispatches we read.

Mr. GARDNER. Of course, I can not know; but before I go on with my speech I am going to read Henry Van Dyke's poem addressed to Germany, which was published a day or two ago. Henry Van Dyke, our minister to Holland all through this war, can not have been misled by censored news. Here is his poem:

MARE LIBERUM.

[By Henry Van Dyke.]

You dare to say with perjured lips:
"We fight to make the ocean free"—
You whose black trail of butchered ships
Bestrews the bed of every sea
Where German submarines have wrought
Their horrors! Have you never thought
What you call freedom men call piracy?

Unnumbered ghosts that haunt the wave
Where you have murdered cry you down,
And seamen whom you would not save
Weave now in weed-grown depths a crown
Of shame for your imperious head,
A dark memorial of the dead
Women and children whom you left to drown.

Nay, not till thieves are set to guard
The gold, and corsairs called to keep
O'er peaceful commerce watch and ward,
And wolves to herd the helpless sheep,
Shall men and women look to thee,
Thou ruthless Old Man of the Sea,
To safeguard law and freedom on the deep!

In nobler breeds we put our trust:
The nations in whose sacred lore
The "ought" stands out above the "must,"
And honor rules in peace and war,
With these we hold in soul and heart,
With these we choose our lot and part
Till liberty is safe on sea and shore.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I will ask the gentleman please to let me continue. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. FESS. Is Dr. Van Dyke's poem an answer to my question? [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Absolutely. That shows that men on the spot form the same opinion of Germany which we form here.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I will yield for one "Amen!"

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. There is a—

Mr. GARDNER. But not for a stump speech.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. There is a serious question in my mind which I would like the gentleman to explain. He has asserted the right of trade to-day with the nations with whom we have the right to do business—

Mr. GARDNER. How does the gentleman know I have?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. The gentleman said he was willing to convoy and defend that trade.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; because we warned Germany that we should hold her to "strict accountability."

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. The question I want to ask is this: Up until the last few weeks, for the past two years have not we had a perfect national and international right to trade with Germany as a free Government and we a neutral?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know; but if we break off relations—

Mr. DAVIS of Texas rose.

Mr. GARDNER. No; the gentleman must allow me to answer. If we break off relations with Great Britain on the ground that she has interfered with that right, you will not hear me on the floor of this House making speeches designed to help a nation with which we have broken off all relations.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. The point with me is not a hypothetical case. It is an actual condition.

Mr. GARDNER. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, William Jennings Bryan proposes that we should prepare ourselves to present a united front to the enemy by first tearing the Nation asunder in a political campaign on the question of peace or war. He and his followers, the pacifists, the extreme socialists, and those who place loyalty to Germany above loyalty to America, are engaged in appealing to the cowardice which lurks in every man's breast.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I can not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. You just attacked a very distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman will please protect his distinguished statesman in his own time.

Cowardice is the consequence of the instinct of self-preservation, the strongest of human instincts. The extent to which a man can overcome the instinct of self-preservation is the measure of his manhood. They are trying—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I decline to yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman answer or not whether he voted for the naval bill?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have my time protected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has notified everybody that he does not want to be disturbed while delivering his speech. The Chair will keep everybody off that he can.

Mr. GARDNER. This cowardice Mr. Bryan and his followers glorify by calling it "good will toward men," and timidity they have rechristened "service to humanity." They are trying to goad the people into a campaign in which class will be arrayed against class and race will be arrayed against race. Smooth-tongued speakers are to be employed and trenchant pens are to be made sharper. Perchance foreign gold may be spent; who knows? Then, when the Nation is successfully split into two halves, animated by hatred of each other, rather than by a joint hatred of the foreign foe; when our courage is at the lowest ebb; when our righteous indignation has been sufficiently aspersed; then we are to vote upon the question of peace or war. If the vote be for peace, we are to submit to any indignities rather than strike back. If the vote be war, as a Nation divided against itself we are to go forth to battle.

The President of the United States, our captain, even now should be nerving us for the struggle. By every means in his power he should frown down this campaign of William Jennings Bryan, who is whispering to the rank and file that death awaits them at every turn; that the cause for which they are enlisted is unjust; that peace and plenty are pleasant things, while the snows of Valley Forge are bitter cold and the rapid fire of machine guns is dangerous. Oh, the instinct of self-preservation is strong in men. Doubtless the Bryans of those days were whispering trembling words to the Minute Men of Lexington. In those days gentlemen were crying, "Peace! peace!" just as they are crying, "Peace! peace!" to-day. They were crying, "Mediate!" and "Arbitrate!" but the patriots fought on instead of parleying, and we gained our liberties.

The pacifists and the copperheads of the Civil War declared for arbitration and mediation and said that the war was a failure and that a convention ought to be called to put an end to the horrible strife and that the question of slavery should be left for future adjustment. But Abraham Lincoln said "No; we have put our hand to the plow and we shall not turn back." We did not arbitrate and we did not mediate. We fought the Civil War to a conclusion. We put an end to slavery, and who is there to-day, North or South, who does not rejoice that we turned a deaf ear to the pacifists of 1864?

It may be that the day shall come when mankind will beat its broad falchions into plowshares. It may be that internationalism will solve the awful problem of war; but I shall not believe in internationalism and I shall not believe in the brotherhood of man as a practical, statesmanlike rule for world government until I find Californians who are willing that their daughters should be married to Chinamen or until I find some Mississippian who is willing that his sister should marry a negro. When those far-off days are here, then I shall know that we have reached the era of the brotherhood of man.

Meanwhile I am an American. I want no internationalism. I want no conglomerate flag of all the nations, with a yellow streak down the middle. I know what the Star-Spangled Banner stands for. I know what it has stood for in history. When I behold it my ears seem to hear the shrill music of Lexington's fifes and the grim rattle of the drums at Concord. There is an echo which reverberates in my head. It is the thunder of Perry's cannon on Lake Erie. I see the sharp escarpment of Missionary Ridge. I see the charge of Pickett at Gettysburg, and I see the stubborn Union battle line whose heroic valor checked that heroic assault. I hear the deep bass of Dewey's guns at Manila, and I hear the sharp rattle of musketry in Cuba. I know what that banner stands for in peace, how it stands for liberty and honesty and courage and for the rights of man; how it stands for the homely virtues of the family and for the friendships which gather around the fireside.

May the God of our fathers ever protect and defend that flag. May it rise triumphant. May it ever be unfolded to the music of the trumpet which shall never sound "retreat," and may it wave forever. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. To ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes so that he can answer a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts want to answer?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended a minute to answer a question. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 20 minutes. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish the newspapers of this country which are now declaring war against a foreign country and endeavoring to involve a hundred millions of American citizens in a strife which is not their business would take note of the fact that the American Congress to-day, by this expression of applause, indicates that it is prepared to be a deliberative body under the Constitution and proposes to exercise its rights. [Applause.] I wish the great editorial writers, whether subsidized or not, would take note of the fact that there is a revival of the independent spirit of Americanism in this old House of Representatives that proposes to stand its ground against any stampeding, whether it be inspired by British gold or German lucre. [Applause.]

Why, I am surprised at the pacific tone of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] this morning. I had expected he would be prepared to declare martial law in the United States, and that under the lead of that eloquent editorial writer, Col. George Harvey, who spoke to us in Washington last night, and pictured the glory of war in Europe, we would hear the "tramp, tramp, tramp" of the American boys coming up from the farms and firesides prepared for the terrible onslaught. I thought we might hear the salvos of applause that would come from the boys in the trenches in France crying "Vive l'Amerique," and from the boys of Great Britain as they exclaimed, "Here come the boys of the United States to share our burdens with us." [Applause.]

But the gentleman from Massachusetts is pacific this morning. The only warlike note that he sounds to-day is the piece of verse that he brings us from Henry Van Dyke, who evidently is as strong a champion of war as the novelist, Owen Wister, who paid an unusual tribute in verse to the President of the United States some time ago; so that all we have before us this morning in addition to the usual "declaration of war" in the newspaper headlines is the poetic recital of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the report of the American Rights League.

Ah, my friend from Massachusetts and my friend Col. Harvey, who spoke last night of the beauties of the war in Europe, let me suggest that the recruiting offices are open and that the ships are carrying munitions back and forth under the protection of British guns, and that every American boy who wants to enlist in the war in Europe is free to go and will be received with open arms on the other side. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I can not yield. But are those who are declaring war, the signers of the Declaration of the American Rights League, including the Washington minister of the gospel who declares that Christ came upon earth not so much to save men as to punish nations—are those signers of the Declaration of the American Rights League and the numerous other editorial belligerents in America resigning their positions and enlisting in this war in Europe to save civilization?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There are many men fighting this foreign battle in the United States who are not prepared to come up to the captain's office and sign up for this war they are agitating, particularly in that aggressive fraternity whose editorials just now are calling upon other men to make the sacrifice. If they were sincere, those who are calling upon the youth of America, the recruiting offices of the Nation would not now be so devoid of volunteers as they are. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I can speak a little for the common people of the United States this morning. I have been hearing from them in

thunderous tones during the last three or four days; the mere reference to the fact that there is a Liberty Bell still existing in the United States, and that the old Hall where American independence was proclaimed and where the Constitution was given to the people still stands, has resounded throughout the country. The responses coming in from every State of the Union are expressive of the American heart upon this question of foreign alliances—with almost a unanimous voice they are sounding praises to almighty God that some men remain in the Congress of the United States who adhere to American principles. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has not been personal in his references, and I am glad he has not, because I would not want to be personal in kind. The gentleman seems to think—in fact, he stated—that my remarks on Tuesday were an indictment of the newspaper press of the United States for publishing false reports that tended to inflame the people and encourage them in the belief that it is their duty to civilization to pull one of the belligerents out of the stress in which it finds itself. I did not make the direct charge.

I stood upon this floor and quoted the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], and I read his speech into the RECORD, which speech charged that the J. P. Morgan interests had arranged with 12 great newspaper men with a view of influencing other newspapers, and that those newspapers—25 of the greatest of them—were being paid for the service they are rendering in the promotion of the war spirit, and in the teaching of a false patriotism in the United States, misleading the people into the belief that this war in Europe is an American war. It was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] who made that charge. He put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And so far as I know not one newspaper in the United States published that remarkable statement; and it was not published at all until I made reference to it on the floor of the House and invited some one of the majority to introduce a resolution to investigate it. I repeat now that challenge to the majority of this House, a challenge to introduce a resolution to inquire whether or not newspapers are actually subsidized as charged, because it is due to honest journalism in the United States that the real facts with regard to this monstrous proposition be known to the taxpayers of this land, whose blood must be let and whose burdens must be tremendously increased if we are to be driven into this fierce controversy across the seas. I will leave that challenge stand for the day. If no one of the majority will introduce that resolution, I shall expect to introduce it myself, in fairness to those men in this country who are writing newspaper articles and publishing newspapers, who want to be free from suspicion that they are under the Morgan influence or that they are dominated by Lord Northcliffe or the moneybags of London or Berlin. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] deals, as I expected he would, with the horrors of war. I give him credit for gallant service in the Spanish-American War, in which he made an honorable record. The gentleman has not seen all the horrors of war; he was not old enough to observe its ill effects in the United States when we had our difficulty more than 50 years ago; but the gentleman has spoken of the horrors of war, and he has dwelt, as these great editors do, upon the bombs flying in the air destroying children and the submarines coming up from the bowels of the sea destroying ships that are carrying munitions to keep the war in Europe going. He pictures all this, but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] does not tell the whole story; his view is restricted somewhat by the influence upon his poetic mind of the verses of the former minister to The Hague.

Did the gentleman from Massachusetts look away down at the bottom of the page of the Washington Post this morning and read this simple announcement—

Holland buys tanks.

And did he read, coming from The Hague, this simple, special cable dispatch, almost buried where it could not be found in the newspaper:

Holland continues to improve and modernize her defenses. Among other ultra-modern war machines which will soon be received here are several tanks. Two frameworks for these machines have just arrived from America.

So we are making war tanks for Holland!

The Army construction work will equip them with armor.

Holland, a neutral country in this war, is preparing to use tanks. Now what are tanks? They are the invention of some American, I understand, and they have already been successfully employed by the British in the trenches in dealing with the Germans. Here in this paper is the picture of a tank, an instrument of terror rolling ruthlessly over the trenches in which the German soldiers are. No notice, no warning. Buried

alive! Crushed in the earth by these amiable instruments of warfare that are manufactured in the United States and are being used by Great Britain to win its victories. If submarines are ruthless, and maybe they are, what are these tanks?

The very paper which publishes the picture of one of these tanks relates how these men cry out in despair, the fathers of children, the husbands of wives made widows; crushed and covered into the very bowels of the earth without warning, just as is charged against the submarine or the aeroplane. Buried in the dead of night without warning. But that is war; it is what is to be expected if we plunge into the kind of war that the gentleman from Massachusetts has been preaching in this House, and that the great editors of this country are urging the President to declare.

The paper from which I quote is opposed to Germany. I have nothing to do with that. I am only pointing out that if the sinking of the *Lusitania* was inhuman, there are other inhuman methods of warfare to which civilized nations apply themselves.

Here is an article from the same paper entitled—

"German brutality on raids by U-boats."

Mr. Noyes, the great English writer, tells us all about it; it is copyrighted for the papers that are to use it in the United States. Then comes the picture on the same page of the apparently praiseworthy and effective work that is being done by the English tanks rolling over the men sleeping in the trenches. The headlines tell us that—

Tanks, airplanes, and guns, not men, will win the war. Land ironclads of huge power foreseen which will make present tractors but toys, and will destroy the country over which they pass. Modern war made so terrible by new monsters of destruction that the prospect of an organized world-controlled hostilities is forecast.

Surely this new method of warfare does not have the sanction of international law.

But the story comes from H. G. Wells, one of the novelists of England, who pictures the terrible execution of these new instruments of war that England is said to employ.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield. The gentleman from Massachusetts, in order to get his facts right, ought not to be pro ally nor pro-German, but a fair, square-deal American. [Applause.] Did he take up the Washington Times of last night? If he did and looked closely into the "afternoon edition," he found, way down at the bottom of the page, so far down that he could scarcely see it—the woman's referendum question takes up most of the column—but way down at the bottom, in an eight-line paragraph, he would find an announcement. Bearing in mind that Germany is the fierce "barbaric power" that is "ruthlessly destroying" little children in their sleep, he should have read this brief article. Here it is. How it got by, the Lord only knows, but here it is at the bottom of the page:

FLYERS KILL 16 TOTS.

BERLIN (via Sayville wireless), February 14.

Funeral services for 16 children killed by English flyers on February 10 were held in the Church of Our Lady, at Brugge, on Sunday, the press bureau announced to-day. The children were skating when the flyers dropped bombs.

It is not one side alone that plays this war game. All countries involved are playing it, and playing it to the limit, and those that may be getting the worst of it at times send out the Macedonian cry to the Government of the United States, now at peace with the world, "to come over and help us." But let us see about this "barbaric" warfare, this killing of these "16 little tots" skating on the ice.

Did this news get very far? If you obtained a copy of the last edition of the Evening Times and examined it from the front to the last column, you would find that even these eight lines had gone out. I do not find fault with the Times. It is doing the best it can, it is a good paper, but somebody slipped a cog, and that item which got into the afternoon edition, telling you how English bombs were dropped on children skating on the ice, was removed from view when the final edition was issued. [Applause.]

Mr. SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 7757. An act authorizing a further extension of time to purchasers of land in the former Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservation, Okla., within which to make payment.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 455. An act to define the rights and privileges of the trustees of municipally owned interstate railways, and constraining the act to regulate commerce with reference thereto; and

H. R. 10697. An act for the relief of S. Spencer Carr.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 8003. An act authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 18453), disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with the exception of amendments numbered 48 and 111.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman can get in like some of the rest of us on the general debate on the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is no conference report to read. The gentleman does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Senate disagreed to the conference report.

Mr. MANN. And that wipes it out.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But I will say that the conferees agreed on all of the articles except four.

Mr. MANN. That may be true, but the conference report has been rejected, and we have been notified to that effect, and that ends it. The Senate has sent a message to the House, which is irregular and unparliamentary, which they probably do not know, stating that they have rejected the conference report, and insist upon four Senate amendments, but what they have done as far as the parliamentary situation is concerned is to insist on all of the Senate amendments. The gentleman should now move, not to ask unanimous consent, to take the bill from the Speaker's table, with Senate amendments thereto, and to further insist upon the disagreement of the House to all of the Senate amendments with the exception of the two which he desires to concur in with amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I move to take the House bill from the Speaker's table, with Senate amendments thereto, and to further insist upon the House disagreement to all of the Senate amendments with the exception of amendments 48 and 111, and to agree to the conference.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the gentleman does not want to agree to the conference yet.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments that I desire action upon, amendments 48 and 111.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to all of the Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill except amendments 48 and 111.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as to amendment No. 48, I move that the House concur in amendment No. 48 with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House concur in Senate amendment 48 with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Senate amendment 48 be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 48.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to approve the assessments, together with maps showing right of way and definite location of proposed drainage ditches made under the laws of the State of Minnesota upon the tribal and allotted land of the Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota.

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to pay the amount assessed against said tribal and allotted lands. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000, to be reimbursable from any funds belonging to the individual allottees, or their heirs, from any funds belonging to the tribes subject to be prorated, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to approve deeds for right of way from such said allottees, or their heirs, as may be necessary to permit the construction and maintenance of said drainage ditches upon the payment of adequate damages therefor: *Provided*, That no patent in fee shall be issued for any tract of land under the terms of this paragraph until the United States shall have been wholly reimbursed for all assessments paid or to be paid on such tract under the terms hereof. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to do and perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions hereof into force and effect.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in that with the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to approve the assessments, together with maps showing right of way and definite location of proposed drainage ditches made under the laws of the State of Minnesota upon the tribal and allotted lands of the Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to pay the amounts assessed against said tribal and allotted lands. That for the purposes specified in this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$60,000, to be reimbursable from any funds in the possession of the United States belonging to the individual allottees, whose lands are benefited, or their heirs, in case of their decease, when the payment relates to allotted lands, and from any funds belonging to the tribes subject to be prorated, when the payment relates to tribal lands. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to approve deeds for right of way from such said allottees, or their heirs, as may be necessary to permit the construction and maintenance of said drainage ditches upon the payment of adequate damages therefor: *Provided*, That no patent in fee shall be issued for any tract of land under the terms of this paragraph until the United States shall have been wholly reimbursed for all assessments paid or to be paid on such tract under the terms hereof. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to do and perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions hereof into force and effect.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight, while it was not so reported, I understand that the gentleman's motion is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out all of the language of the Senate amendment and inserting in lieu thereof the language which the Clerk has just read.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that so that the Clerk may have that record.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Texas is that all of the language of Senate amendment No. 48 be stricken out and the matter just read in the nature of an amendment be substituted therefor.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in the reading by the Clerk of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas one clause was omitted, and is probably omitted from the copy sent to the Clerk's desk, namely, the clause after the words "said tribal and allotted lands"—

on account of benefits accruing to said lands by reason of the construction of a drainage ditch or ditches under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman a complete copy?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman send that up and have the complete copy substituted for the other.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the following substituted for the language just reported by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 48, with an amendment striking out all of the language of amendment No. 48 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to approve the assessments, together with maps, showing right of way and definite location of proposed drainage ditches made under the laws of the State of Minnesota upon the tribal and allotted lands of the Indian reservations of the State of Minnesota. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to pay the amounts assessed against said tribal and allotted lands, on account of benefits accruing to said lands by reason of the construction of a drainage ditch or ditches under the laws of the State of Minnesota. That for the purposes specified in this section, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$60,000, to be reimbursable from any funds in the possession of the United States belonging to the individual allottees, whose lands are benefited, or their heirs, in case of their

decease, when the payment relates to allotted lands, and from any funds belonging to the tribes subject to be prorated, when the payment relates to tribal lands. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to approve deeds for right of way from such said allottees, or their heirs, as may be necessary to permit the construction and maintenance of said drainage ditches upon the payment of adequate damages therefor: *Provided*, That no patent in fee shall be issued for any tract of land under the terms of this paragraph until the United States shall have been wholly reimbursed for all assessments paid or to be paid on such tract under the terms hereof. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to do and perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions hereof into force and effect."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that this amendment came from the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. It was not put in the bill in the House for the reason that it is legislation. The Senate, however, inserts everything of that kind it desires, as we know, and in order to come to an agreement with the Senate on this amendment we submit the present substitute for the Senate amendment, and that is the parliamentary situation at present. I desire to state that the committee investigated the matter and we believe that the relief asked for should be granted. The situation is this: The Indians are situated in a drainage district in that State. The State has laws regulating these matters and the Indians are interested equally with the whites and the citizens of the State relative to the drainage of this land. What benefits one benefits all and it is a piece of legislation that is needed in that country, and we received from the gentleman from Minnesota his amendment that covers the same ground that the Senate one does. For that reason we ask that the substitute be adopted.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I first yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the conferees when they went into the conference found this proposition in the bill, and after an examination it was decided that neither the language nor the amount appropriated was sufficient to do the thing that was contemplated by the amendment. The conferees had no right under the rules of the House to put in the language necessary to have the work done, and certainly had no right to exceed the amount appropriated by this amendment. So rather than exceed our authority we brought the matter back to the House, all of us agreeing that the proposition should be taken care of. I yield back the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire some time? I will yield him some time.

Mr. STEENERSON. Very well.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield the gentleman from Minnesota five minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: What is the difference between the substitute as offered by the gentleman from Texas and the proposition as offered by the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota to answer the question himself.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The substitute is mine.

Mr. STEENERSON. But the gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment and then the gentleman from Minnesota offered an amendment or a substitute to his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can say there is no difference except I found the Clerk, in reading the one sent up by the chairman of the committee, omitted to read one clause, and thereupon I sent up my copy, which the Clerk read in its entirety.

Mr. STEENERSON. Where did this originate?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman, if I have permission, four years ago I received a request from the Fond du Lac Reservation in our State, that has been open to white settlement, for some kind of legislation that would enable the construction of ditches serving allotments of Indian tribal lands similar to the construction of ditches in purely white territory under the laws of the State. I thereupon framed a law, which passed—

Mr. STEENERSON. An act of Congress?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes; an act of Congress. That was confined to the Fond du Lac Reservation. At that time it was suggested in the Indian Office that it might be possible to have the terms so broad as to cover the entire State, but we did not enact it in that form at that time.

Under this act which formerly was passed they proceeded in that county and on the reservation to establish the drainage ditch, and, as the gentleman well knows, it is a court matter, and the court proceedings in our State have been complied with and all the surveys have been made and estimates of the benefits

made, so every piece of land, whether belonging to whites or Indians, has now assessed against it the proportionate benefit it will receive from the construction of this ditch. That work was completed more than a year ago. The original act required plans and specifications for the ditch should have to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and he had full discretion in this matter. It was thought advisable to give him full discretion in order that the rights of the Indians might be absolutely and completely protected. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through an engineer whom he sent out there a year and a half ago and again last year, suggested that some modification in the plans was needed in order that some of the Indians might have their rights absolutely protected beyond peradventure and thereupon modifications were had, the last only occurring a very few weeks ago, about two weeks ago, and a final statement from the engineer sent out by the Indian Office was made as to certain minor details that would have to be changed. They have made those changes and at their request it is necessary to have an appropriation. I found that the Indian Office, while the bill was in the Senate, had asked that there be inserted in the Indian appropriation bill legislation giving general authority in drainage matters all over the northern part of the State, so that the law will be applicable to the White Earth Reservation or any other place where Indian lands might be affected by drainage propositions. So when the bill went to conference it contained this provision which the Senate had inserted, and they had authorized an item of \$15,000, which they thought would be sufficient, though this did not have any provision made for this particular drainage proposition. That was all that was thought necessary. I may say this is ready for actual action.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is on the Fond du Lac Reservation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is on the Fond du Lac Reservation. We found the assessed benefits against all the Indian allotments—and there are several hundred of them—amount to \$35,000. Therefore I suggested we increase the \$15,000 to \$35,000, so that this Fond du Lac proposition could now be taken care of and we would not have to pass a general law, which was satisfactory to all persons interested, but it has been suggested that there might be need of more than the \$35,000 and \$15,000, and so out of caution we authorized the Secretary, in his discretion, to draw up to \$60,000, but no more. So the law is applicable generally to the State as it now stands, and substantially it takes care of this proposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a further question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. I believe he states that this provision has the approval of the Interior Department?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am informed by the Senators that it was submitted to the Interior Department; and some of the language, I think, they changed to suit themselves, and it does meet with their approval.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has no direct information?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Except in this, that I conferred with the drainage engineer in the Indian Office and with the administrative officer that has general charge of matters of that kind. I was unable to get hold of the commissioner, because he was not in his office. I recollect that I talked briefly with Mr. Meritt, the assistant commissioner, while he was on duty at the Senate end of the Capitol, and he did not disapprove it.

Mr. STEENERSON. As I understand the provision now, it will include all the Indian reservations in Minnesota—the Red Lake Reservation, where there are no allotted lands, and the White Earth Reservation, where the lands are allotted?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But there will be no action without additional appropriation, the gentleman will understand.

Mr. STEENERSON. I understand.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It was understood in the Indian Office—and that is the point on which I conferred with Mr. Meritt particularly—that \$35,000 is to take care of the drainage proposition in Fond du Lac Reservation.

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] any information as to whether this provision is satisfactory to the Department of the Interior?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Only through the conference of the two Houses. We discussed the matter, and we had the information that, without a dissenting voice, if this matter had

been placed before the House originally the House would have agreed to it, but that it would have been subject to a point of order because it was new legislation.

Mr. STEENERSON. You have no communication from the Interior Department?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Interior Department has no objection to it, I understood it from the hearings of the Senate on this item. I think it is very beneficial at this point.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman that I received several protests from people who had lands on the White Earth Reservation, stating that this project was inimical to the interests of the Indians. The gentleman has heard nothing about it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is all in the hands of the Secretary, and if he sees that it would be injurious to any of the Indians he has discretion to use the funds as he sees proper.

Mr. STEENERSON. I can see where it would be beneficial to the Red Lake Reservation, where there are 300,000 acres of swamp land.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The senior Senator from Minnesota has carefully gone over this, and it meets with his entire approval.

Mr. STEENERSON. I had not heard anything about that. I received two protests from the White Earth Reservation, stating that they were sent to Senator CLAPP and Senator NELSON and myself, and those are the only objections that I have heard.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. After we investigated the matter we were sure that this legislation should pass in the shape that it is now in.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is satisfied that it would be for the interest of the Indians on all these Minnesota reservations?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It comes out of their funds. It is reimbursable.

Mr. STEENERSON. I understand that where the expense of the drainage project benefits the tribal land it is paid out of the tribal funds, and where it benefits individual allotments it is taken out of the funds of the allottees?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield to me? I received one protest from Mr. Beaulieu, I think it was, against this proposition, which was the only dissenting voice I have heard, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. STEENERSON. My information comes from other sources.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. One of the Senate conferees stated the Indian Bureau was favorable to this and so expressed itself in the Senate hearings. I did not look up the hearings to verify that statement, but after looking into the proposition and seeing that the drainage of all these lands might be stopped and held up unless something was done, and a large portion of these lands might be held up unless something was done to provide for running the ditches across the Indian lands, it then seemed to me imperative that we take some action in the premises, and we next looked to see if there was any violation of any treaty, because in view of the Choate against Trapp case, if you have a treaty with an Indian that his land can not be taxed for any purpose, an act of Congress would be invalid. We were advised that no treaty was being violated in case we should provide to take these funds out of the tribal funds for drainage across the Indian lands in order that the Indian might be benefited along with the white man.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman is, I think, himself as well acquainted—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] has again expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. I want to ask the gentleman a question, because I believe the gentleman is as well informed concerning the actual conditions on the Indian reservations in Minnesota as any man in the House.

Does the gentleman—and I take it that he understands the nature of the proposed legislation—see any objection in legislation of this character?

Mr. STEENERSON. No.

Mr. NORTON. This permits the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to pay for the benefits from the construction of drainage ditches received by the allottees of these Indian lands?

Mr. STEENERSON. In answer to the question of the gentleman from North Dakota, I will say that from my general knowledge of the drainage laws of Minnesota and my knowledge of the conditions of various reservations I believe this

provision would be very beneficial. But I would further say that I have received no petition or request from any of the reservations, and I have never heard from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or any department officials about it. So I wanted to be informed. I am satisfied that this legislation may result in the reclamation of very large tracts of land which are now valueless and do it in an equitable manner, so as to distribute the cost as it ought to be distributed.

Mr. NORTON. It has impressed me as being very desirable. I can see, of course, that it may be objectionable to some allottees. Some individuals would not wish to have a drainage ditch constructed near their lands in any case. They might have no reasonable ground for objection, but would object on general principles, on account of their contrary nature.

Mr. STEENERSON. These two land owners who have communicated with me say they live on high and dry land, and are afraid that they would be taxed for the drainage of lands that are wet.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Under our law such a man could not be taxed for the drainage of high and dry land.

Mr. MURRAY. I will state to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] that this is very much like the legislation passed a few years ago concerning the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. STEENERSON. In Oklahoma?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. This is like the act passed for Lincoln County, in that in its administration it is left in the discretion of the Secretary. We must presume that the Secretary will not permit assessments that are wrong upon the Indians.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I desire to take a few minutes' time to assure my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] that he ought to have been consulted in legislation of this character, no matter where it originated, and I am sure he would have been consulted if it had originated in this Chamber. If this legislation had emanated from the Indian Office originally no doubt it would have been brought to his attention and the opinion of the gentleman would have been asked in reference to it. I drafted, as I said, a bill making this the law for the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation. I was going to put it in the conference report, and found they had put in this, so I seized hold of this framework and changed it, so far as it was necessary to make it good law, and then it was agreed upon by the conferees.

One word further. I think, as the gentleman says, this is a law capable of producing a great deal of benefit to the Indians in certain portions of Minnesota. The gentleman is familiar with the Red Lake Reservation, much more so than I, and I perhaps am more familiar with some other sections than he. In all these lands we have invited the whites to go in and take the unallotted lands and improve them along with the Indians, and road building has been encouraged in order that the Indians and white men might progress side by side. In some portions of that country, in order that there may be any development at all, drainage is necessary. I have received many letters—scores of them from this section—to the effect that a great part of the land in this section is covered with water and at certain times the people have to move about in boats, and the development of such lands is impossible unless a drainage proposition like this goes through.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] has called attention to the fact that all these laws vest in the Secretary of the Interior full authority for the protection of the Indians. We have one test of that with respect to this project that I have mentioned. I can say without reservation that the Secretary of the Interior, through his subordinates, has exercised unbounded care to protect the Indian in all these assessments against him. In fact, they have used a microscope on him. In fact, the Indian allotments here are protected better by far than any of the lands held by the whites on the same proposition. The Indian Office has required a change and a variation in these plans in every particular where they thought there was the slightest doubt or where they thought the welfare of the Indian was not properly conserved. Therefore, exercising this discretion, the Secretary has amply protected the Indians, and this project will be for their eternal benefit and welfare. Therefore I hope it will be agreed to without dissent.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Are the commissioners who are appointed to assess the damages named by the district court?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. And they make a report back to the court?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes. It has to be approved by the court under the law. Of course, it is all done by engineers. We have ditch engineers in the State who survey out the projects, locate them, assess the benefits, and make up the plat. That has all to go to the court, and proper evidence has to be given to show that the benefits have accrued, and then the court approves.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 48 with an amendment. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask that amendment No. 111 be reported.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman offering an amendment to it?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; it is a Senate amendment. We desire to concur in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment 111. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is for an increase of salary.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 27. That to provide during the fiscal year 1918 for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$480 or less and for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 per annum and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to employees who are appropriated for in the act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that this does not apply to employees of the Indian Bureau in this city. That proposition is cared for in another bill now pending in the House. This does apply to Indian employees outside of the city of Washington. This is the recommendation of the Senate, and each one of your conferees was in favor of this amendment. It begins with the employees receiving the lowest amount of salary, and gives them a raise of 15 per cent up to a certain point and 10 per cent above that. Above a thousand dollars nothing is given to them, according to the amendment just sent up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to recede—

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me 15 minutes?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman 15 minutes, if he desires to discuss the motion. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has an hour, if he desires to use it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-one Members, not a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Allen	Costello	Guernsey	McCracken
Barchfeld	Cullop	Harrison, Miss.	McCulloch
Barnhart	Dale, N. Y.	Haskell	McFadden
Beakes	Davenport	Haugen	Maher
Beales	Dewalt	Henry	Matthews
Benedict	Dickinson	Hicks	Miller, Del.
Bennet	Doolling	Hill	Mooney
Blackmon	Drukker	Hinds	Morgan, La.
Bruckner	Edwards	Hulbert	Moss
Buchanan, Tex.	Estopinal	Husted	Mudd
Campbell	Farr	Keister	Oglesby
Cantrill	Ferris	Kincheloe	Patten
Carew	Fitzgerald	Kitchin	Porter
Carter, Mass.	Flood	Lee	Pou
Casey	Flynn	Lever	Price
Chandler, N. Y.	Foster	Lewis	Rowland
Chipfield	Gandy	Liebel	Rucker, Mo.
Cline	Garrett	Linthicum	Russell, Ohio
Coleman	Graham	Lloyd	Sabath
Connelly	Gray, Ind.	Lobeck	Schall
Conry	Griest	Loft	Scott, Pa.

Scully
Sells
Shackelford
Sherley

Slomp
Smith, Idaho
Smith, N. Y.
Steele, Pa.

Stout
Taggart
Talbot
Vare

Williams, W. E.
Winslow

The SPEAKER. On this vote 335 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman what arrangement we can make relative to a division of time between those speaking for and those speaking against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman has control of the time. I do not suppose I will use all of the 15 minutes which I have. If I do not, I will yield it back to the gentleman, and I think it will develop how much time is needed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state that I want to make an equal division of time if possible. I have quite a number of names here—

Mr. MANN. I hope I will not use all of my 15 minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the proposition which is before us will determine the attitude of the House with reference to the increase of salaries of Government employees. There are to-day in conference three appropriation bills—the legislative appropriation bill, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the District of Columbia appropriation bill—and in each case there is in conference now what is called the Smoot amendment of the Senate, giving increases in salaries to employees receiving \$1,000 or less, and there is what may be called the Committee on Appropriations proposition, which was to give an increase of 10 per cent of salary to all receiving less than \$1,200 and 5 per cent to all receiving between \$1,200 and \$1,800. These two propositions are in conference between the House and the Senate on the three appropriations which I have mentioned. The Indian appropriation bill now before the House contains as a Senate amendment what is called the Smoot amendment, which gives an increase in salary up to and not above \$1,000 in salary.

Well, there are a great many ways of skinning a cat, and here is a parliamentary method, I will not say intended, but which would have had the effect of preventing the House ever expressing its opinion on any of these things if the motion made had been permitted to go through without calling it to the attention of the House. For that reason I made the point of no quorum. The present proposition is for the House to concur in the Smoot amendment on the Indian appropriation bill. That is a privileged and preferential motion. If the House concurs in the Smoot amendment on the Indian appropriation bill, the House confers on the other bills will take this as the instruction and position of the House on the subject, and they will promptly agree in conference to the Smoot amendment on the other appropriation bills, and will be entitled to do so.

Now, the present proposition before the House is to concur in the Senate amendment. That is a preferential motion. At this stage of the proceedings a motion to concur in a Senate amendment takes precedence over a motion to concur with an amendment. If the House wants to abandon the position it took when it voted on the legislative appropriation bill and make no increase in salaries where the present salary amounts to over \$1,000, then the committee should vote for the pending motion to concur in the Senate amendment, because that will eliminate any increase in salaries where salaries exceed \$1,000. If the House declines to concur in the Senate amendment and votes down the present motion, then a motion will be offered to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment inserting in the Indian appropriation bill the same amendment which the House put in the legislative bill, in the Agricultural bill, and in the District of Columbia bill. We have before us now for determination whether we will vote against increasing the salary of any of the Government employees according to these terms where the salary amounts to over \$1,000.

I was not willing to let the House put itself on record without its knowing the facts. The motion was made and we were about to have a vote. I made the point of no quorum and have stated the matter to the House, as I ought to in all fairness. If the House does not want to give an increase of salary where the salary amounts to more than \$1,000, but wants to take the Smoot amendment as it passed the Senate, then it should vote

to concur in the Senate amendment, and under the present motion it would be a vote of "aye." If Members do not want to do that, but want to insist on the position of the House that there should be an increase in salaries up to \$1,800, they should vote "no" on the pending motion, and then there will be another motion presented on which they can vote, maintaining the position of the House.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to state that the increase in the Senate amendment is to provide during the fiscal year of 1918 increase of compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at the rate of \$480 or less, and an increase in compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees receiving more than \$480 and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, and so forth.

Mr. MANN. That is the Smoot amendment, and I thought that everybody understood what it was; but if they do not it is easily stated. The House proposition was to increase by 10 per cent all salaries below \$1,200, and an increase of 5 per cent for all salaries from \$1,200 up to \$1,800, inclusive. The Senate proposition is to increase salaries 15 per cent up to \$480, and 10 per cent from \$480 to \$1,000, and no per cent above \$1,000. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for recognition it was largely for the purpose of saying to the House just what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, that we might not vote under any misapprehension on the motion made by the gentleman from Texas. There are five of these appropriation bills, all involving salaries, either now in conference or in the Senate, and will be in conference with either the House provision or both provisions embodied in them in disagreement between the two bodies.

As a conferee on the part of the House in one of these bills—and I know other gentlemen charged with the responsibility feel the same way about it—I have felt that I would like to have the House take from us the responsibility of determining whether or not it was going to stand for the original House provision as passed in the legislative bill, increasing by 10 per cent for the fiscal year 1918 all salaries below \$1,200 and 5 per cent all those salaries from \$1,200 to \$1,800, both inclusive, or whether they prefer the amendment placed in bills in the Senate of 15 per cent increase in all salaries below \$480, and 10 per cent on salaries between \$480 and \$1,000.

I think, too, that the House ought to know, as nearly as can be calculated, the amount of money involved in each of these provisions. The amount involved in the provision in the legislative bill and carried in all the five appropriation bills into which it will be incorporated, will require something like \$30,000,000 to meet the increase for the fiscal year.

Mr. COX. That is in all the appropriation bills?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In all the appropriation bills carrying salaries, about \$30,000,000. The Smoot amendment involves a little less than half that amount, or thirteen or fourteen million dollars.

I know that there are men in this House who feel that the salaries of all these people ought to be increased. On the other hand, there are a great many others who believe that their present wage is greater without any increase at all than the wage for a like service rendered in private employment. I think the House ought to take this into consideration and it ought to take into consideration the condition of the Treasury and the other expenditures that we are making from the Treasury. If these people were not as well paid as other people or people in private employment, if their hours of labor were onerous, or if the conditions under which they work were unfavorable, then it seems to me that there might be some excuse for us to pick out these people who have the good fortune to be employed by their Government and give them a bonus and tax the other people who have not the good fortune to be employed by their Government to pay the bill. My own personal view about the matter is that both amendments ought to be stricken out, although I have no hope that we can do it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does not the gentleman think we ought to strike out these increases in view of what Gen. Wood and Admiral Fiske have told us about the American people being effeminated by their luxurious lounging on cushioned chairs and sleeping in downy beds and riding in limousines and wearing kid gloves?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That does not apply to an employee of the Government who receives \$480 a year.

Mr. LANGLEY. Nor \$1,000.

Mr. CALLAWAY. According to their statement it applies generally to all of the American people. They say that this business has so effeminized us that it is necessary for us to now go to war.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not think any Government clerk is weighted down by the amount of work that he has to perform. He may be fatigued in his search for something to do in some of these departments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to yield me a little more time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three more minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that he did not think the Government clerk was weighted down by the amount of work he had to perform. He might have added nor by the amount of money he is obliged to carry about.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, no; and neither are a great many other people in the gentleman's district and in mine. There are thousands of wage earners who do not receive a salary equal to that of the Government employee, and they have to pay a tax to increase the salaries of these fellows here. There is not a man here in whose district that does not apply. I dare say that the average wage earner in the district of any man upon the floor receives less than the average wage of the Government employees in any branch of the Government service, and I know his hours of labor are longer and the character of work that he has to do is more onerous. Believing that, I shall take the very least that I can get; and I want to state to the House that I shall vote for the motion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], that the House concur in the Senate amendment known as the Smoot amendment. If the House expresses that judgment, then, as one of the conferees on another bill, I shall walk into the conference and take the same action without coming back to the House, believing that I am warranted in doing so, and so will the other conferees on these other bills. My hope is that the House will vote for the motion of the gentleman from Texas to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] will be voted down. If that happens, the House will then be in a position to vote to concur in the Senate amendment with the House provision or such an amendment as may seem proper. I think the Members of the House thoroughly understand the situation as it is presented to us. The House provided for an increase for a year of 10 per cent in all of the salaries up to \$1,200 and 5 per cent in the salaries from \$1,200 up to \$1,800. The Senate proposes a 15 per cent increase of the salaries up to \$480, 10 per cent increase of the salaries from \$480 to \$1,000, and no increase beyond that. What is the situation with regard to the Government clerks? In a general way I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] that the Government pays its employees liberally and well in the higher grades, but that is not true with regard to the many low-paid employees of the Government. Before the recent increase in the cost of living these people were not generally receiving more than was paid by private employers for the same class of work, and since the increase in the cost of living that has come under this Democratic administration, private employers have increased the pay of their employees all of the way from 5 to 25 per cent, while these low-paid employees of the Federal Government have received no increase. The Secretary of Commerce of this administration, in a report made a short time ago, estimated the increase in the cost of the most important articles entering into the cost of living in the last year of 34 per cent, and the most that we have suggested as an increase to anyone is 15 per cent to charwomen, and a few other very low-paid employees, and 10 per cent to the employees up to \$1,200 and 5 per cent up to \$1,800. The difficulty about the Senate amendment is this: It reaches only the thousand-dollar-a-year employee, and so far as the clerical employees and skilled labor under the Government are concerned the Senate amendment affects comparatively few married employees. It does help a very deserving class of employees, many of whom are married, like the custodians of public buildings, the engineers and firemen about the public buildings, and certain other employees in the field service and

elsewhere, but, when you come to the grade of skilled labor and the lower-paid clerical help, the thousand-dollar limit reaches comparatively few of those who need it most, to wit, the married employees, because below \$1,000 the places are to a very considerable extent filled by young men and young women who have no one dependent upon them; when you reach the grade a little higher, then you get into the positions held by those who have been in the service long enough to have reached the higher pay and to have taken upon themselves the responsibility of a family.

These people need our help more than any other class of employees under the Government, and I say to you gentlemen that from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations it is to me as plain as anything can possibly be that the highest increase proposed in any of the amendments is not enough to relieve many of these people from actual distress. It is exceedingly difficult for them to live and support their families decently on the sums they are now receiving.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. All right.

Mr. MONDELL. If the motion of the gentleman from Texas is voted down, and I have an opportunity, I shall make a motion, or hope some one else will, to this effect: That we accept the Senate amendment so far as it relates to the employees getting \$480 and give them 15 per cent. That as to the 10 per cent raise, we advance that to the point fixed in the House provision, \$1,200, and that we add to the Senate amendment the 5 per cent provision offered in the House for employees from \$1,200 to \$1,800. That will be a provision of 15 per cent increase up to \$480, 10 per cent up to \$1,200, and 5 per cent from \$1,200 to \$1,800. And I say to you gentlemen, after a pretty careful consideration of these matters as they have been presented in the committee by the officers in charge of the bureaus and departments of the Government, that that increase is the very least for which we can in good conscience afford to vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will, but I have only a minute.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the gentleman think it is an equitable distribution wherein a man drawing \$1,100 gets \$110 whereas a man drawing \$1,200 will only get \$60?

Mr. MONDELL. There is no plan on which you can arrange it that will not leave some inequities. If the gentleman can propose a plan that will not leave such an inequity, I will be glad to join him; but we have not the time to go into the matter in any great detail now. We are proposing a temporary provision to partly, at least, meet the present situation, and I hope we will do it in a fair and decent way. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER], a member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me this amendment should be adopted. I do not know how any man can live in the city of Washington or any place else on less than \$2.50 a day. In my town, which has very little manufacturing, surrounded by a rural community, a laboring man doing common labor receives \$2.25 every day that he wants to work, working nine hours, and oftentimes, particularly from April to November, you have to engage a man two or three days ahead to get him at that price. How can a man live in the city of Washington on \$500 or \$600 a year? If I had to live on \$500 or \$600, if that is all I could get for myself and my family, I think I would prefer the almshouse, where they and I would be taken care of and do what little work I could do for them there. It comes with ill grace from people all over the United States, who are receiving large salaries and large incomes, to refuse to give to a man, the head of a family, enough money to feed them, so that at least they will not go to bed hungry, to at least clothe them reasonably well, to enable them to live like human beings, and, considering what we get, considering what we receive, considering what we are paid, I hope that this House will vote to give the miserable, measly little increase to these employees that is asked for in this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL].

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment or if this motion is not adopted, I shall be glad to vote for the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. In other words, I believe that the lowest-paid employee should have at least a 15 per cent increase, that those up to \$1,200 should have a 10 per cent increase, and up to \$1,800 a 5 per cent increase, but at this time we will be called upon to choose be-

tween these two amendments, and it seems to me that whether we are in favor of helping people who need help the most or whether you are in favor of cutting down the amount of money that is to be taken out of the Treasury, we should favor the motion of the gentleman from Texas to concur in the Senate amendment.

The people who are receiving \$480 or less are the most in need of this increase. The people who are receiving more than \$1,000, I believe, are in need of an increase, too, but when I must choose between whether I shall help a man whose standard of living has been affected by the increase in the cost of living or help the man whose standard of luxury and savings is affected, I shall choose on the side of the man whose standard of living has been affected. As has been said here, the amount of money that will be taken from the Treasury will only be about one-half as much by taking the Senate amendment in preference to the House amendment. I want to give another reason as to why I am in favor of the Senate provision. There has been a great deal of talk when this question of raising salaries had been brought up at different times about the short hours of work by men in the Government employ. The fact of the matter is that the lowest-paid employees of the Government work the longest hours. If I must choose between which class of employees should not be helped, I shall choose not to help those who work the least number of hours. [Applause.] So that it seems to me that we shall be acting in accordance with the demands of the people who need help the most; we shall be acting in accordance with the theory that he who works longest should be helped first; and we shall be acting in accordance with the demands of the Federal Treasury, which some gentlemen seem so much concerned about when we talk about wages, but seem to have no concern whatever about it when we talk about spending it for some imaginary need of munitions that happen to come up in the House. So for these three reasons it seems to me the Senate amendment is preferable to the House amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this provision was gone over very thoroughly when the legislative bill was before the House. It will be recalled that in that bill we increased the pay of our own secretaries and clerks \$500 per year. It will be recalled we gave an increase of 5 per cent to every employee of the Government who received a salary of \$1,200 to \$1,800, both inclusive. The Senate amendment grants no increase to a person who receives a salary of \$1,200 or more. It gives, as has been stated, 15 per cent to the charwomen instead of 10. To those employees who work only a small portion of the day, if you please, who have other employment, it increases their wage 15 per cent, but it does not do a thing for the person who is the head of a family, the man who ought to have our sympathy.

When the fortification bill was before the committee that framed it, those who came before the committee stated that it was necessary to pay 25 per cent more for material now than a year ago, and when asked why, they said the whole increase practically resulted from an increase in the wages paid by the manufacturers throughout the country. The facts are, my friends, that every financial institution in the land, every manufacturing institution in the land, is increasing the pay of its employees. And can it be said that this House is a progressive body if it will stand pat and refuse, in view of the greatly increased cost of living, to give a reasonable increase to the Government employee who is at the head of a family, but who gets only \$1,200 or \$1,220 a year? That is what this proposition is.

The Auditor for the Post Office Department has about 700 employees under him. I asked him a few days ago how many heads of families among the employees in his department would be affected by the House provision and how many would be affected by the Senate provision. In that great department, if we adopt the Senate provision, we will only benefit 44 out of 700 employees, but by the House provision we will benefit, if that is adopted, 185 men who are heads of families. [Applause.]

Take the naval appropriation bill, and many of the increases in that were made necessary because of the increased cost of producing guns and naval stores. We recognized the increase of wages paid by the employer in those institutions, and we granted larger appropriations because of that fact, but we say to these employees of the Government, "We will not do for you what we are encouraging manufacturers to do for their employees, and that is, increase the wages of our employees."

Now, whatever is done in this House to-day with regard to this item, we will, of course, do, as was stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], in the legislative bill, the

District bill, and the other supply bills. It seems to me the House ought to be consistent and vote down the provision that is inserted in this bill, and it ought to vote to include in the bill the same proposition that was included in the legislative bill, and that would give an increase to all of the employees of the Government who receive salaries of \$1,800 or less.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. If the House refuses to agree to the present amendment, will the gentleman offer to concur with an amendment inserting the House proposition?

Mr. GOOD. I have an amendment to that effect, and if this is voted down I will offer a motion to concur with an amendment, and that amendment will be the exact proposition which this House finally adopted when the legislative bill was before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON], a member of the conference committee.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it has been very clearly stated what the effect of the adoption of this amendment would be. Whether we adopt the motion to concur in this amendment or not, it seems to me, should depend upon a fair consideration of the salaries now being paid Government employees and the salaries being paid employees in similar private employment. As far as my observations have gone I do not find that for the most part Government employees are underpaid. I know that in my section of the country—and not only in my own congressional district, but throughout the Northwest—there are hundreds, yes, thousands of men and women employed in productive occupations who are not being as well paid for their time and labor as the employees in the Government service in that section of the country or in this section of the country.

I know if we were to listen to and be guided in our actions by the newspapers of Washington and by the magazines that claim to officially represent Government employees, which newspapers and magazines are largely, if not altogether, dependent for their existence on the patronage of Government employees, the last dollar in the Treasury would be the only limit to the increase of wages granted.

A few weeks ago I had the opportunity of spending some time at Panama and the Canal Zone. There the Government employees, like here in Washington, are loudly clamoring for an increase in wages, without any thought or consideration of what men and women outside of the Government service are receiving for their days and hours of toil in similar lines of work. As is well known, there has been an attempt made to represent to the people throughout this country that the climatic and health conditions on the Canal Zone are very bad, and that it is a great patriotic sacrifice for anyone to remain in the Government employ on the Canal Zone, whereas, as a matter of fact, the health conditions and the working conditions on the Canal Zone are almost ideal.

I am not going to take the time now to recite at length some of the conditions I found down there recently. At some future time I expect to occupy the time of the House in presenting some facts concerning conditions on the Canal Zone that will be of interest to the House. I want to say here and now that I never saw employees anywhere in the country—and I have been over pretty much all of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian boundary to the Gulf of Mexico—living in more ideal conditions than are the Government employees down there. But are they satisfied with what the Government is paying them? No; not at all, and will not be as long as they are led to believe that the Treasury of the United States is open for further easy raiding.

Now, I believe, and I want to say it in the short time I have, that this amendment is a fair amendment to adopt under all existing labor and living conditions in this country. I have always believed in helping the man who works most and who is receiving relatively the least compensation. The man or woman who receives \$480 a year or less in the Government service is the one who is doing relatively the most and the hardest work, and who most needs an increase if there is any increase to be given to Government employees. I believe that we will be doing a fairness and a justice to adopt this amendment at this time, but I do not believe that there is any just need now to make a horizontal increase in the salaries of those receiving more than \$1,000 a year.

The men who, for the most part, are paying the taxes to meet the salaries of Government employees are working throughout the country long hours. Out in my country to-day men who do not receive for their labor more than an average of about

\$1.60 a day are feeding cattle, feeding horses, and doing the never-ending work on the farm not for 8 hours a day, with 60 days a year for vacation, but they are working 10, 12, 14, and 16 hours a day. They are delving down in snow banks 3 to 10 feet deep to-day to get out hay and feed for their live stock. They are working from early dawn to late at night to produce the products the Nation must have to eat and wear. They it is who by their hard toil supply the funds for taxes to pay the salaries of Government employees who are working six or seven hours a day and who are living a life of comparative ease. Those things and those conditions, gentlemen of the House, should be taken into consideration in determining this question.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. RICKETTS. I understand you to say the laboring men in your State are working for \$1.60 a day and 10 to 14 hours a day?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; those who labor on our farms. They do not receive on an average more than that.

Mr. RICKETTS. Do you notice any difference in the high cost of living in your State?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; we have noticed a difference in the high cost of living. We have to help pay for all these people who are nonproducers throughout the country, and who occupy most of their time in demanding an increase of wages.

Mr. RICKETTS. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to put the Government employees in the same category with the people in your State that perform agricultural or manual labor?

Mr. NORTON. I will tell the gentleman what it would be my purpose to do. If I could, to-day, I would place a large percentage of the employees of the Government in this country and other men now in nonproductive occupations on a salary that would induce them to go into productive occupations; into lines of industry where they would produce things for themselves and other people of this country to eat and wear. This would equalize and lower the cost of living more than anything else of which I know.

Mr. RICKETTS. I agree with you on that proposition. I have no quarrel with you about that at all. But does the gentleman know that the cost of living in Washington is now higher than it has ever been, that you can not buy a pound of sugar in the city of Washington for less than 15 cents?

Mr. NORTON. I know what the high cost of decent living is, and I know what the cost of high living is throughout the country. But we here are helping to produce and continue this condition. We are inviting young men and women into the Government service at high wages and taking them out of productive employments. We are creating a condition such that you can not hardly get a young man to work on the farm any more. He will tell you that he prefers to go to an agricultural experiment station conducted by the Government where he will receive a salary of \$100 or more a month. He will not work on a farm at \$50 a month. He usually has in mind to go to Washington or elsewhere in the Government service, where he can have easy employment, short hours, and a fat salary to be paid out of the taxes supplied by those not in the Government employ.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do you pay as high as \$50 a month in your State for farm hands?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; we pay as high as \$50 a month in my State for farm hands.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am glad to know that. I worked once for \$25 a month.

Mr. NORTON. Well, I may say I have worked for \$15 a month on the farm and worked harder than any Government employee here in Washington is required to work.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And I was glad to get it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly; I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. NORTON. No. I am not entirely mistaken, nor am I partly mistaken. I know pretty well about farm-labor conditions in the gentleman's State; and I want to say to the gentleman that the employees in the Government service in Iowa are to-day better cared for and receive better salaries than the farm laborers who are producing the things to eat and to wear for these Government employees. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. What I had reference to was his comparison of the salaries paid by the Government with salaries paid by institutions in Washington. I had the Bureau of Efficiency get some information for me, and I have it here. That information is to

the effect that the street railway companies pay more for common laborers than does the Government in the city of Washington, and firms like Woodward & Lothrop and contractors in Washington pay more for clerk hire than the Government does in Washington. I have that information here. Of course the gentleman knows it is not fair to compare a salary in Washington with the salary paid in some little town of 300 or 400 inhabitants, where the people have their chickens and their pigs and their gardens and all that sort of thing. The conditions are not comparable.

Mr. NORTON. In these little towns to which you refer they work from 10 to 16 hours a day. Many of these country people are doing that. I want to say this to the gentleman, in reply to his statement as to salaries paid in Washington in private business and in the Government service: Did the gentleman ever have this thought occur to him that if all those employed in the Government service to-day were discharged and their positions were open it would not take very long to fill these positions from those employed in private business to-day in Washington? Everywhere you go here in Washington citizens of Washington are clamoring to get into the Government service. To anyone who has not acquired the Washington viewpoint the eagerness of men and women here to get into the Government service does not evidence that they can secure and are securing higher salaries in private employment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] to concur in Senate amendment No. 111, providing for an increase of salary of employees in the Indian Service, as follows:

That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$480 or less, and for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 per annum and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to employees who are appropriated for in the act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

It provides an increase in the salaries of 15 per cent of those employees now receiving a salary of less than \$480 per annum and an increase of 10 per cent in the salaries of those receiving more than \$480 per annum and less than \$1,000 per annum.

If an opportunity is given to vote an increase in the salaries of those receiving more than \$1,000 and less than \$1,800 per annum I shall vote for a 10 per cent increase for them.

At present the only motion before us is to concur, and I therefore vote for that. I think conditions justify this increase. It is fair and moderate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House should insist on the 10 and 5 per cent increases. There is a fundamental distinction between Government employment and private employment which should not be disregarded. The private employer has the wages which he pays determined not by any rule of ethics, not by the question whether it is right or wrong, not whether the wages paid is sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living. The private employer determines the wages primarily by the condition of the labor market. He has no compunctions about it. He never considers the question whether the wage is sufficient to enable a man to live the life of a man. In determining wages for Government employees you can not afford to be guided by the law of supply and demand. You can not afford to be governed by the conditions of the labor market, because after all the man who uses the expression "labor market" in the sense in which the potato market is referred to or the wheat market is referred to has the soul and the mind of a narrow, petty merchant, and is very little of a man.

There has been such a tremendous increase in the cost of living that it is almost impossible for the man of small means to exist. The man who gets \$1,000 or \$1,200 or \$1,800 a year feels this extraordinary increase in the cost of living just as sharply as the man at the very bottom of the social and economic ladder, just as sharply as the man who has become so accustomed to privation that it is a part of his existence. And because it is extremely difficult to measure with any degree of definiteness the agony and the suffering endured by the man who gets less than \$1,200 a year and the agony and suf-

fering endured by the man who gets less than \$1,800 a year, I believe both groups are entitled to an increase of wages, and that the House should persist in its opposition to the Senate amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances the fairest thing to do is to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], who is in charge of this bill, for a moderate increase to those low-priced employees of the Government. We can not make in the Government service any fair comparison with temporary conditions which may exist in some private employment at the present time. There are several reasons for that. In the first place, the wages in private employment have been so low, habitually so low, that an increase of 10 per cent in the average wage of private employees would not bring them up anywhere near to the average level of Government salaries. I think it goes without challenge, and has gone without challenge, that in many departments of the Government, particularly in Washington, wages have been adjusted at from 15 to 40 per cent higher than for similar service in any other employment.

There is another reason why we can not compare the conditions with private employment at this time. The Government service has the advantage of being continuous. Not only are the hours short, but Uncle Sam is an employer who never misses a pay roll, who never has slack times, who never has a strike, a lockout, or a boycott. None of the ordinary disabilities that affect the labor market elsewhere occur here in Washington or in the Government service. A man has his full year's work and his full lifetime work, if his record and service are good.

Take the ordinary skilled employee belonging to a first-class, high-grade labor union; take a structural steel worker, who gets \$5 a day when he works; his business is of a seasonal character, and if he works 200 days in the year at a gross income of \$1,000, he is having a good, prosperous year. In the bad years he does not earn so much, and the best year may amount to \$1,000 or \$1,200. The time lost in lockouts, strikes, boycotts, and unemployment, depression in business, sickness, and ill health he pays for out of his own pocket. The man here in Government employ has a steady job year in and year out at \$1,000 or \$1,200 or \$1,400, so that we are bound to increase only the lower-grade employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment 111 and agree to the same.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. STEPHENS of Texas) there were—ayes 52, noes 80.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three Members present; not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 111 and agree to the same will, when the roll is called, answer "yea" and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 132, nays 215, answered "present" 2, not voting 84, as follows:

YEAS—132.

Abercrombie	Connelly	Heflin	Moss
Adair	Cox	Helm	Murray
Adamson	Cullop	Helvering	Nicholls, S. C.
Aiken	Decker	Hensley	Norton
Allen	Dent	Hilliard	Oldfield
Almon	Dickinson	Holland	Oliver
Ashbrook	Dies	Hood	Overmyer
Ayres	Dill	Houston	Padgett
Bailey	Dixon	Howard	Page, N. C.
Barkley	Doolittle	Huddleston	Park
Barnhart	Doremus	Hughes	Quin
Bell	Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey
Black	Eagle	Jones	Raker
Blackmon	Edwards	Key, Ohio	Randall
Boober	Fields	Kincheloe	Rauch
Borland	Flood	King	Rayburn
Burgess	Gandy	Kitchin	Rouse
Byrnes, S. C.	Gard	Konop	Rubey
Byrnes, Tenn.	Garner	Lever	Rucker, Ga.
Caldwell	Godwin, N. C.	Lewis	Russell, Mo.
Candler, Miss.	Gordon	Lloyd	Saunders
Caraway	Gray, Ala.	McClintic	Sears
Carter, Okla.	Gray, Ind.	Miller, Pa.	Shallenberger
Church	Hardy	Montague	Sherley
Cline	Hastings	Moon	Sherwood
Collier	Hayden	Morrison	Shouse

Sisson
Slayden
Small
Steagall
Stedman
Steele, Iowa
Steenerson

Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Nebr.
Stephens, Tex.
Summers
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas

Tillman
Venable
Winston
Walker
Watkins
Watson, Va.
Webb

Whaley
Williams, W. E.
Wilson, Fla.
Wilson, La.
Wingo
Wise
Young, Tex.

NAYS—215.

Alexander
Anderson
Anthony
Aswell
Austin
Bacharach
Beales
Bowers
Browne
Brumbaugh
Buchanan, Ill.
Burke
Burnett
Butler
Cannon
Capstick
Carlin
Carter, Mass.
Cary
Charles
Coady
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, W. Va.
Cooper, Wis.
Copley
Crago
Cramton
Crisp
Crosser
Curry
Dale, Vt.
Dallinger
Danforth
Darrow
Davis, Minn.
Davis, Tex.
Dempsey
Denison
Dillon
Dowell
Driscoll
Dunn
Dupré
Eagan
Edmonds
Ellsworth
Elston
Emerson
Esch
Evans
Fairchild
Farley
Fess
Focht

Fordney
Foss
Frear
Freeman
Fuller
Gallagher
Gallivan
Gardner
Garland
Gillett
Good
Goodwin, Ark.
Gould
Gray, N. J.
Green, Iowa
Greene, Mass.
Greene, Vt.
Griffin
Hadley
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hamlin
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Haugen
Hawley
Hayes
Heaton
Helgesen
Hernandez
Hollingsworth
Hopwood
Howell
Hull, Iowa
Humphreys, Miss.
Hutchinson
Igoe
Jacoway
James
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Kahn
Kearns
Keating
Kelster
Kelley
Kennedy, Iowa
Kennedy, R. I.
Kent
Kettner
Kiess, Pa.
Kinkaid
Kreider
Lafean
La Follette
Langley
Lazaro
Lee
Lehlbach
Lenroot
Leshar
Liebel
Linthicum
Littlepage
London
Longworth
Loud
McAndrews
McArthur
McDermott
McGillcuddy
McKellar
McKenzie
McKinley
McLaughlin
McLemore
Madden
Magee
Mann
Mapes
Martin
Mays
Meeker
Miller, Minn.
Mondell
Moore, Pa.
Moore, Ind.
Morgan, Okla.
Morin
Mott
Neely
Nelson
Nichols, Mich.
Nolan
North
Oakley
Olney
O'Shaunessy
Paige, Mass.
Parker, N. J.
Parker, N. Y.
Peters
Phelan
Platt
Porter
Powers
Price
Ramseyer
Reavis

Reilly
Ricketts
Riordan
Roberts, Mass.
Roberts, Nev.
Rodenberg
Rogers
Rowe
Sanford
Scott, Mich.
Siegel
Sims
Sinnott
Sloan
Smith, Mich.
Smith, Minn.
Smith, Tex.
Snell
Snyder
Stafford
Steele, Pa.
Sterling
Stiness
Stone
Stout
Sulloway
Sutherland
Sweet
Swift
Switzer
Tague
Tavener
Temple
Thompson
Tilson
Timberlake
Tinkham
Towner
Treadway
Van Dyke
Volstead
Walsh
Ward
Watson
Watson, Pa.
Wheeler
Williams, T. S.
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, Ill.
Wood, Ind.
Woods, Iowa
Woodyard
Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Browning Sparkman

NOT VOTING—84.

Barchfield	Dewalt	Henry	Oglesby
Beakes	Dooling	Hicks	Patten
Benedict	Drukker	Hill	Pou
Bennet	Dyer	Hinds	Pratt
Britt	Estopinal	Hulbert	Ragsdale
Britten	Farr	Humphrey, Wash.	Rowland
Bruckner	Ferris	Husted	Rucker, Mo.
Buchanan, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ky.	Russell, Ohio
Callaway	Flynn	Lieb	Sabath
Campbell	Foster	Lindbergh	Schall
Cantrill	Garrett	Lobeck	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Glass	Loft	Scully
Casey	Glynn	McCracken	Sells
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham	McCulloch	Shackleford
Cherfield	Gregg	McFadden	Slomp
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Maher	Smith, Idaho
Coleman	Guernsey	Matthews	Smith, N. Y.
Conry	Hamill	Miller, Del.	Taggart
Costello	Hamilton, Mich.	Mooney	Talbott
Dale, N. Y.	Harrison, Miss.	Morgan, La.	Vare
Davenport	Haskell	Mudd	Winslow

So the motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment 111 was lost.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. PATTEN with Mr. BENNET.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. CHIFFERFIELD.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. HILL.

Mr. GARRETT with Mr. McCULLOCH.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. McFADDEN.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BARCHFELD.
 Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. BENEDICT.
 Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. BRITT.
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. DYER.
 Mr. CASEY with Mr. BRITTEN.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. COLEMAN.
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. GLYNN.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. HICKS.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. STEAGALL with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. MCCracken.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. LOFT with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.
 Mr. HENRY with Mr. MATTHEWS.
 Mr. HULBERT with Mr. MILLER of Delaware.
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio.
 Mr. POE with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SCHALL.
 Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
 Mr. TAGGART with Mr. SELLS.
 Until Monday, February 19:
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
 A quorum being present, the doors were reopened.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a preferential amendment. I move to recede from the disagreement to Senate amendment 111 and concur in the same with an amendment striking out all of the language of the Senate amendment and inserting in lieu thereof the following, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves to amend Senate amendment 111 by striking out the same and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 27. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, is a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa in order?

The SPEAKER. Not after the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we would like to have the amendment again reported; we did not hear the rate of increase.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for half a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. This proposed amendment is precisely the same as the provision which the House inserted in the legislative bill, in the Agricultural bill, and as an amendment to the District of Columbia bill.

Mr. COX. Does this only provide for one year?

Mr. MANN. It is precisely the same as that provision in the other bills.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. MANN. Upon that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 282, nays 60, answered "present" 3, not voting 88, as follows:

YEAS—282.

Abercrombie	Barnhart	Byrnes, S. C.	Collier
Adair	Reales	Byrns, Tenn.	Cooper, Ohio
Aiken	Blackmon	Caldwell	Cooper, W. Va.
Alexander	Boehrer	Capstick	Cooper, Wis.
Allen	Bowers	Carlin	Copley
Anderson	Browne	Carter, Mass.	Crago
Anthony	Brumbaugh	Carter, Okla.	Cramton
Ashbrook	Buchanan, Ill.	Cary	Crisp
Austin	Buchanan, Tex.	Charles	Crosser
Ayres	Burke	Church	Cullop
Bacharach	Burnett	Cline	Curry
Bailey	Butler	Coady	Dale, Vt.

Dallinger	Hawley	McKinley	Shallenberger
Danforth	Hayden	McLaughlin	Sherley
Darrow	Hayes	McLemore	Shouse
Davis, Minn.	Heaton	Madden	Siegel
Davis, Tex.	Helgesen	Magee	Sims
Dempsey	Helvering	Mann	Sinnott
Denison	Hernandez	Mapes	Slayden
Dent	Hilliard	Martin	Sloan
Dill	Holland	Mays	Smith, Mich.
Dillon	Hollingsworth	Meeker	Smith, Minn.
Dixon	Hopwood	Miller, Del.	Smith, N. Y.
Doolittle	Houston	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Tex.
Doughton	Howard	Miller, Pa.	Snell
Dowell	Howell	Mondell	Snyder
Driscoll	Huddleston	Montague	Stafford
Dunn	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Pa.	Stedman
Dupré	Humphreys, Miss.	Moore, Ind.	Steele, Iowa
Eagan	Hutchinson	Morgan, Okla.	Steele, Pa.
Edmonds	Igou	Morin	Stephens, Nebr.
Ellsworth	Jacoway	Moss	Sterling
Elston	James	Mott	Stiness
Emerson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Murray	Stone
Esch	Johnson, Wash.	Neely	Sulloway
Evans	Kahn	Nelson	Summers
Fairchild	Kearns	Nicholls, S. C.	Sutherland
Farley	Keating	Nichols, Mich.	Sweet
Fess	Keister	Nolan	Swift
Fitzgerald	Kelley	North	Switzer
Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Oakey	Tague
Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Olney	Tavener
Foss	Kent	O'Shaunessy	Temple
Frear	Kettner	Overmyer	Thompson
Freeman	Kiess, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Tilson
Fuller	King	Parker, N. J.	Timberlake
Gallagher	Kinkaid	Parker, N. Y.	Tinkham
Gallivan	Konop	Peters	Towner
Gandy	Kroder	Phelan	Treadway
Gard	Lafan	Platt	Van Dyke
Gardner	La Follette	Porter	Volstead
Garland	Langley	Powers	Walker
Gillett	Lazaro	Price	Walsh
Glynn	Lee	Raker	Ward
Good	Lehlbach	Ramseyer	Wason
Goodwin, Ark.	Lenroot	Randall	Watkins
Gordon	Leshner	Rauch	Watson, Pa.
Gould	Lever	Reavis	Whaley
Gray, Ala.	Lieb	Reilly	Wheeler
Gray, N. J.	Linthicum	Ricketts	Williams, T. S.
Green, Iowa	Littlepage	Riordan	Williams, W. E.
Greene, Mass.	Lloyd	Roberts, Mass.	Williams, Ohio.
Greene, Vt.	London	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, Fla.
Griffin	Longworth	Rodenberg	Wilson, Ill.
Hadley	McAndrews	Rogers	Wilson, La.
Hamilton, N. Y.	McArthur	Rowe	Wingo
Hamlin	McChintie	Rube	Woods, Iowa
Harrison, Va.	McCracken	Russell, Mo.	Woodyard
Hart	McDermott	Sanford	Young, N. Dak.
Hastings	McGillcuddy	Saunders	
Haugen	McKenzie	Scott, Mich.	

NAYS—60.

Adamson	Dickinson	Kincheloe	Sisson
Almon	Dies	McKellar	Small
Aswell	Eagle	Moon	Steagall
Barkley	Edwards	Morrison	Stephens, Miss.
Bell	Garner	Norton	Stephens, Tex.
Black	Glass	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Borland	Godwin, N. C.	Oliver	Taylor, Colo.
Burgess	Gray, Ind.	Padgett	Thomas
Callaway	Hardy	Park	Tillman
Candler, Miss.	Hefflin	Quin	Venable
Caraway	Helm	Rainey	Vinson
Clark, Fla.	Hensley	Rayburn	Watson, Va.
Connelly	Hull, Tenn.	Rouse	Webb
Cox	Johnson, Ky.	Sears	Wise
Decker	Jones	Sherwood	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Browning	Fields	Page, N. C.
----------	--------	-------------

NOT VOTING—88.

Barchfeld	Bruckner	Hughes	Pratt
Benkes	Dyer	Hulbert	Ragsdale
Benedict	Estopinal	Humphrey, Wash.	Rowland
Bennet	Farr	Husted	Rucker, Ga.
Britt	Ferris	Key, Ohio	Rucker, Mo.
Britten	Flood	Kitchin	Russell, Ohio
Bruckner	Flynn	Lewis	Sabath
Campbell	Foster	Liebel	Schall
Cannon	Garrett	Lindbergh	Scott, Pa.
Cantrill	Graham	Lobeck	Scully
Carew	Gregg	Loft	Sells
Casey	Griest	Loud	Shackleford
Chandler, N. Y.	Guernsey	McCulloch	Slemp
Chipfield	Hamill	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Coleman	Hamilton, Mich.	Maher	Sparkman
Conry	Harrison, Miss.	Matthews	Steenerson
Costello	Haskell	Mooney	Stout
Dale, N. Y.	Henry	Morgan, La.	Taggart
Davenport	Hicks	Mudd	Talbott
Dewalt	Hill	Oglesby	Vare
Doelling	Hinds	Patten	Winslow
Doremus	Hood	Pou	Wood, Ind.

So the motion of Mr. Good was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. CANNON.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. HULBERT with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. VARE.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. HASKELL.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. STEENPERSON.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. BENEDICT.

Mr. RUCKER of Georgia with Mr. FARR.

Mr. STOUT with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a pair with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT]. I wish to withdraw my vote of "yea" and be recorded "present."

The name of Mr. BROWNING was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair announced the following conferees: Mr. STEPHENS, of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, and Mr. NORTON.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the support of the Army; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to six hours, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and three hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, and pending the motion asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to six hours, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the other half by the gentleman from Alabama. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. SAUNDERS in the chair.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of something more than \$247,000,000. It is a little less by \$20,000,000 than the amount carried in the Army appropriation bill last year. It is something over \$70,000,000 less than the original and supplemental estimates furnished by the department. In making these remarkable decreases from the estimates the committee has not been unmindful of the fact that at the last session of the present Congress the national-defense act largely increased the appropriations for the Military Establishment. The committee, therefore, has seriously and carefully undertaken to provide for every feature contained in the new legislation enacted by this Congress at this last session, without imposing any unnecessary burdens upon the Public Treasury. I may say further that the Military Committee early in its hearings reached the conclusion unanimously that at least this was not an opportune time for any radical changes in the military policy of the country as established by this Congress only at its last session. The committee has not gone into the question of universal compulsory service, therefore, which has agitated the public mind in some quarters in the past few months. While the committee itself has taken no formal action upon the subject, there are members of the committee who regret that some officers high in authority have prejudged the national-defense act of last June, pronouncing it a failure in advance. It is to be exceedingly regretted that officers high in authority, who hold their commissions under the law created by Congress, and who receive their compensation from the Congress, should have been willing in advance to pronounce the action of this Congress a failure without giving this legislation a fair and an impartial trial. Certain it is that whatever may be the merits of the legislation adopted by Congress at its last session for the national defense, that legislation must necessarily prove a failure if administered by hostile or unfriendly hands. [Applause.]

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, not in particular criticism of any officer of the Army of the United States, but I think that it is due to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House that this statement should be made to the Congress, for such facts have developed in the hearings before our committee.

But to return specifically, Mr. Chairman, to the bill. There has been some criticism in some quarters that this bill is too small; that we have not legislated in such a manner as to properly take care of the Military Establishment. That criti-

cism naturally followed by reason of the fact that this committee has found a way to largely reduce the estimates made by the War Department. Take, for instance, the question of pay of the Army. The committee reduced the estimates for pay of the Army by something over \$15,000,000. Now, let us see just for illustration how the committee arrived at its figures upon that subject. The committee very carefully ascertained from the Quartermaster General's Department what the per capita cost of the Army was. We took the figures given by that department itself as to the per capita cost of the Army, as to the pay of the Army, as to the subsistence of the Army, as to the regular supplies of the Army, as to transportation of the Army, as to clothing and equipage of the Army, and what did we find? We found that the pay of the average enlisted man of the Army is \$227 a year, \$237 a year when given extra pay for superior marksmanship and the like; whereas when you consider the entire enlisted strength of the Army of all departments, the line and staff, Quartermaster Department, the Medical Corps, and the line of Army, it averages \$267. What then did the committee find? It found that the War Department was estimating upon that per capita basis for an Army of practically 170,000 officers and men.

We then investigated the present and past conditions in order to ascertain the size of the Army we really ought to appropriate for. We found that the largest Regular Army that this country has ever had was on the 31st day, I think, or the 30th, of last October, when they had 92,000 enlisted men of the line and 112,000 of enlisted men and staff corps combined, so that the largest total of the Army of all the various branches of the Regular Establishment was 112,000 men. We found another thing in making the investigation, because we saw no reason for making an appropriation for an Army of 170,000 men when the War Department had no prospect of getting it. We recalled that about a year ago this Congress adopted a joint resolution increasing the strength of the Army from 100,000, the strength under the old statute prior to the national-defense act, by 20,000, increasing it to an Army of 120,000 men. That resolution was adopted under pressure here in Congress. The resolution was passed when the situation in Mexico was acute; and yet, although that resolution has been on the statute books for nearly 12 months, the Army has failed to fill its ranks up to the number authorized by the resolution by something like 6,000 men. So that this committee felt, with the past experience of the Army and with the present conditions confronting us, we would be very liberal indeed if we appropriated for the increase of 20,000 men of the line over the 92,000, the highest number we have ever had, and then allow 20,000 for the staff corps, making something like 132,000, thus giving a margin of something like 3,000. We then estimated for an Army of 135,000 men, a very liberal estimate, and that is how we reached the conclusion by which we reduced the amount by \$15,000,000. [Applause.]

Now, I repeat, we have pursued the same process, the same method of calculation, when we came to appropriate for the subsistence of the Army, because we had the per capita cost and we had agreed on substantially the number of men we should appropriate for. The same reasoning and the same rate was applied with reference to the regular supplies, incidental expenses, transportation, clothing, and equipage. This committee, when it came to the subject of barracks and quarters, water, sewers, and hospitals for the Army, have been, we think, exceedingly liberal in giving the department a fair proportion of the estimates which were called for. We have provided liberally for civilian instruction on rifle ranges. We have provided abundantly for civilian training camps. We have appropriated freely for vocational training in the Army. All of these things provided for by the national-defense act have been taken care of by this committee, I repeat, in such a manner as to give to the War Department freely and ungrudgingly all that they needed to carry out the purpose of the act adopted last June. When it came to the subject of aviation we appropriated \$9,000,000, and when there is added the \$4,800,000 which the Fortifications Committee appropriated for hydroplanes for coast defense, there has been allowed nearly \$14,000,000 for that service. It must be remembered also that it has only been a few months since the last appropriation bill of August 29 authorized \$13,000,000. We feel we have been exceedingly liberal in this branch of the service. Of course, as suggested, that does not include what is carried in the naval appropriation bill for similar purposes. We have appropriated \$3,000,000 for the Regular Establishment and \$2,500,000 for the National Guard for the purchase of automatic machine guns.

Now, there has been a controversy on the floor of this House, in the committee, and in the War Department as to the character of guns that should be purchased and used in the Army.

Our committee reached the conclusion that that was purely an administrative matter, and even if we had the authority we could not fairly undertake to pass upon the character of automatic machine guns which should be used in the Army. But we have given to the department an appropriation which will enable them during the next year to add a supply of something over 2,000 automatic machine guns to the Army, even conceding the purchase of the highest priced guns that are on the market; whereas if we purchased some guns of higher price and some of lower price, then they will be able, perhaps, to add to their supply something like 4,000 additional guns.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman explain in regard to the type of machine gun and the reason why the department would probably not appropriate all of the money for the more expensive, which is a heavier type of machine gun?

Mr. DENT. Well, in response to the suggestion of my colleague on the committee, as I recall the testimony before the committee, the department is still investigating the different types of gun, and they propose to try out several different types, and the board is to meet, I believe, in May to make some final tests on the subject.

Mr. TILSON. That is especially true as to light guns. They have already arrived at a conclusion which they think is satisfactory in regard to the heavy gun, namely, the Vickers gun, but as to the lighter type of gun, which is just as necessary, they have not arrived at any conclusion.

Mr. DENT. That is true, as I understand.

We have also provided, Mr. Chairman, an appropriation of something like \$600,000 for armored motor cars, which the committee thinks is ample for the purpose. Then we have placed in this bill for the first time in any Army appropriation bill—

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman indulge me just a moment on the motor-car proposition?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the testimony before the committee disclose the fact that the Bureau of Ordnance has only experimented with two motor cars up to the present time?

Mr. DENT. That is very true. They have experimented with only two, and they have found one, I believe, to be too heavy and the other to be too light.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee to what extent they have experimented with motorcycles?

Mr. DENT. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman definitely as to what extent, but they have experimented with motorcycles down on the border to a considerable extent, as testified to before the committee.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The purpose of the bureau is to buy quite a number of armed motorcycles with a side car.

Mr. DENT. That is the idea.

Mr. KAHN. I think something like three or four hundred of those.

Mr. DENT. I have forgotten the number, but they purpose to purchase a number of those with side attachment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman recall the testimony, if there was any, as to whether the motorcycle with the side van is successful or whether those without were more preferable or vice versa?

Mr. DENT. I do not recall whether there was any contrast between the two, but they said the one with the side attachment had proven very successful.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the one without was more serviceable than the one with the side van in use on the Mexican border.

Mr. DENT. I do not know that there was any contrast between the two.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will yield, the intent of the bureau is to buy 230 motorcycles at \$1,000 each; 690 with side-car attachment, at \$500 each; and 115 with side-car attachment, at \$450 each.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe I stated—and if I did not, I intended to do so—that while we have largely reduced the estimates submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs in all essentials, this committee has not been at all parsimonious.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I simply wished to suggest to the chairman that I think it would be well, while he is explaining the bill, if he would mention the different details in the law; that is, the

new legislation that will be offered either by amendment or that is now contained in the bill.

Mr. DENT. You mean the new legislation that is incorporated in the bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I will get to that in the latter part of the bill. I will refer to that as soon as I finish the details. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for his suggestion.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, on the subject of supplying field artillery and ammunition for field artillery for the National Guard the department asks us originally for \$10,600,000, and this committee allowed \$10,000,000 for each one of those items in the bill. So I might go on and enumerate the different substantial and essential things that we have appropriated for and that are taken care of in order to effectuate the purposes of the national defense that was enacted at the last session of Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know that I understood the exact number that the gentleman stated we were now short in enlisted men of the full amount that was allowed under the national-defense act.

Mr. DENT. I do not know whether I understand the gentleman to mean under the first or the second increment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman made a general statement under which I understood him to say that there were about 6,000 short.

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that my statement in that connection was made relative to the joint resolution that we passed here about a year ago—I think some time last March—increasing the enlisted strength of the Army from 100,000, which it was then under the law, to 120,000, and we were 6,000 short. We got only about 14,000 men under that call for the additional 20,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. We are now about 6,000 short?

Mr. DENT. Short of that; but we are very short of the increments authorized under the national-defense act.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman to state the exact number. How many enlisted men are authorized in the Army to-day?

Mr. DENT. They are estimating for about 134,000 for the first increment and about 170,000 for the second.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And how many have we actually in the service?

Mr. DENT. We have in the enlisted strength, the highest the committee has been able to find, 92,000. That is the latest report The Adjutant General gives us.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Has not the gentleman confused the enlisted strength of the line with the total enlisted strength? I have the exact figures here, if the gentleman will allow me to state them.

Mr. DENT. I am perfectly willing to have the gentleman state them if I have not stated them correctly.

Mr. GARDNER. The authorized strength of the Army up to July, 1917, is 133,166 men, but that includes enlisted men of all sorts. We had in the Army on December 31 last 109,959 enlisted men of all sorts. In the enlisted strength of the line—that is, the fighting force—we had on December 31 last approximately 84,771, while the total authorized strength of enlisted men of the line for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, is 100,083. So we are short 15,000 enlisted men of the line. But we are short 23,000 enlisted men, altogether. I think when the gentleman gave his first figure he gave the number of enlisted men of the line. When he gave his second figure he referred to the entire enlisted force.

Mr. DENT. That is the fact. The figures I gave were based on the report given in October from The Adjutant General.

Mr. GARDNER. This information bears the date of February 2, 1917.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman state how enlistments are going?

Mr. DENT. Gen. McCain states to the committee that they were getting 2,000 a month.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is that a net gain?

Mr. DENT. That is a net gain, because the Secretary has suspended the operation of the law allowing a man after he had served three years to go into the reserve on account of the Mexican situation.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DILL. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the National Guard status under the law of last year? That is,

have the National Guard of the different States supplied their quota? Are they enlisted up to the requirements?

Mr. DENT. Well, it is very difficult for me to answer that question except in a general way. The National Guard had a strength at one time in mobilization camps and on the border of something like 144,000 officers and men, and as I recall the national-defense act under the second increment provided for the increase of the National Guard the total strength next year will be something like 160,000.

Mr. DILL. Do you know what it is supposed to be for this year?

Mr. DENT. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. DILL. I mean for the past year.

Mr. DENT. It is enlisted up to its full strength this year; absolutely, and even more than its full strength.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without going into further details, I may state in a general way, having mentioned the National Guard, that the committee has made liberal appropriations for carrying out the national-defense act, so far as the exception of the National Guard features are concerned, with the end in view that the National Guard should have a fair opportunity to be thoroughly tried out, in order to determine whether it was to be a success or a failure. This bill, of course, was written for times of peace. It is not a war measure. It does not go into operation and effect until the 1st day of July next. Therefore it is intended solely to carry on the Military Establishment in times of peace and not in times of war.

We have incorporated some additional legislation in this bill, mainly of minor importance. It may be only fair that at this point I should call attention to the fact that the committee did adopt a proviso that the increase in the officers of the Army provided for in the national-defense act in five annual increments should not take place except as to one-fourth of those officers until the enlisted force in the Army would require the officers. We think this is a wise provision in the law. In other words, we are 1,700 men short in second lieutenants, and do not propose and do not think it is fair that under the national-defense act on the 1st of July each year for the five years therein provided for you should promote the first lieutenants and captains and majors and colonels until you would have three colonels for one regiment and several captains for a company that have not men. We have offered it for the purpose of providing that promotions shall not be made until the enlisted strength keeps some pace with the increase of officers.

There is another feature of this bill that has created a great deal of comment, and I think it is perhaps the most important general feature of the legislation that we have incorporated in the bill, and that is the amendment relating to the assignment of the number of staff officers to duty in the District of Columbia. The law passed last June provides that the number of those officers shall be limited to 55. It further provides that not more than one-half of those 55 shall at any time be assigned to duty within the District of Columbia.

The Secretary of War spoke to me and wrote me a letter on the subject, in which he did state that perhaps we had better increase the number. I stated in the personal interview that I had with the Secretary that I thought it would be a mistake to undertake to radically change that provision at the present session of Congress, and I made the suggestion to him that I was going to submit to the committee a proposition authorizing the President of the United States to suspend that provision of the act during war, actual or threatened, or during any similar public calamity. The committee unanimously agreed to that provision, and, in my humble judgment, it will accomplish everything that is necessary in case of any emergency. Under it the President can bring the whole 55 officers of the General Staff here to Washington if he needs them, whereas if we had adopted the suggestion of the General Staff and increased it to 92 and left the law to read as it was written he could bring only 46.

Now, there are some other minor provisions in the bill relating to legislation that I do not deem it necessary at this time to call attention to.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to ask if the committee took up the question of providing for compulsory training and compulsory service?

Mr. DENT. The committee did not. I stated at the outset of my remarks, I will say to the gentleman, that the committee early in its hearings came to the conclusion that we would not suggest any material or radical changes in the legislation provided at the last session, and therefore we did not go into that,

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to amplify his statement?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. KAHN. During the hearings, when Gen. Scott, Chief of Staff, was before the committee, he was asked whether the General Staff of the Army had prepared a universal training bill. He said they had not completed it. He was asked whether it would be possible to complete it in the near future, so that it might be introduced. He said he thought he could get it ready in about 30 days. He has not sent it to the committee as yet, although it was fully six weeks ago when he agreed to have it before the committee in 30 days.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I understand that the General Staff are in favor of compulsory training.

Mr. DENT. Yes; they are, if Gen. Scott has a right to speak for them.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Let me ask this further question: Suppose we should have a serious emergency at the present time and require a great number of men—a million or two million men—how would they be raised under present conditions?

Mr. DENT. They would be raised, of course, first, by increasing to war strength the Regular Army; second, by increasing to war strength the National Guard; and, third, by calling for volunteers. And I want to state to the gentleman in that connection that Congress in the last few years—I believe it was in April, 1915—passed a volunteer officers' bill that was reported to the Congress by the Military Committee of the House. That law is now on the statute books, and provides all the machinery necessary for a volunteer army in the event that Congress declares war; so that all the Congress would have to do would be to declare war and provide the means, the machinery for the President to execute the volunteer bill being already provided.

Mr. KAHN. The national defense act in such an emergency would also permit the President to call immediately to the colors all of the increments.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Did the committee take up the question of raising the pay of the enlisted men?

Mr. DENT. They did not.

Mr. SANFORD. One question to complete that thought. Then is it the policy of the committee—are we forced to the policy practically that if we had an emergency and had to raise a million or two million men we would have to rely for our defense, for the bulk of our Army, practically on untrained men, this measure, of course, being, as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has said and as his predecessor, Mr. Hay, said, I think truthfully, only a peace program? For a war program we rely on untrained men practically wholly, do we not?

Mr. DENT. It depends altogether on what the gentleman means by "practically." Of course, we have a large number of men, practically small compared to an army of 10,000,000 men—

Mr. SANFORD. We have in our Regular Army for home defense—that is, in the United States—surely not more than 40,000 men.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, yes; we have more.

Mr. SANFORD. The gentleman would not call that an army for any modern purpose.

Mr. DENT. We have more than 40,000.

Mr. SANFORD. Not more than 42,000.

Mr. DENT. I think 60,000.

Mr. SANFORD. I think the gentleman is in error as to that. I think if we had our full increment under the national defense act we would have only 50,000.

Mr. DENT. Be that as it may, suppose we should change the policy now, and we should be precipitated into a war right away. Certainly whatever policy we change would not get into operation in time to accomplish any good.

Mr. SANFORD. If we changed it immediately, would we not have the advantage of beginning to train now instead of beginning to train after some emergency arose, at least a few months' advantage?

Mr. DENT. We would have that advantage, if we are not getting it now under the legislation adopted.

Mr. SANFORD. I realize that we are not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] will recall that in every war in which this country has been engaged, and in the war now in Europe, after a few months the Regular Military Establishment, so to speak—that is, the normal peace military establishment precipitated into that war—has practically been wiped out, and all the rest of the war conducted by what were raw levies of volunteer troops only a few months before. That was the story of the Civil War, and the story of all the great wars of the country.

Mr. SANFORD. May I ask just one question? The gentleman does not mean to say that is the modern condition? I will admit that England's Army, which was very much like ours, was wiped out in a few days.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is what I said.

Mr. SANFORD. But was there any army except England's that was in a condition similar to ours?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the old regular army of France has pretty well disappeared.

Mr. SANFORD. France had had training for years and years.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am not talking about the system. I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's idea as to the system, but I was referring to present conditions.

Mr. SANFORD. The gentleman is making it clear that we are practically in the same condition that we were a century ago.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. DENT. That depends altogether on whether the act passed in the last session is going to accomplish some good. Most of us believe it has not had a fair trial.

Now, I believe in a general way I have covered this subject, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EMERSON. Did the committee consider at all the advisability of furnishing arms to and training the students in the higher schools and colleges of the country?

Mr. DENT. I really neglected to mention that. There are so many items in this bill, I did not cover them all. The national-defense act provides for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the War Department asked us for an appropriation of something over \$3,000,000—

Mr. KAHN. Four million dollars.

Mr. DENT. Practically \$4,000,000, and we gave them every cent they asked for for that purpose and for ordnance supplies.

Mr. McKELLAR. We appropriated the money to secure the training of 50,000 men in that Officers' Reserve Corps this year, and I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] that we have appropriated money for the training of 158,000 of the National Guard. We have appropriated money in another committee for 26,000 young men in the agricultural schools. We have appropriated money in this bill for the training of 50,000 men in the civilian training camps, and, together with the Officers' Reserve Corps, with the National Guard, and those that are trained in the Regular Army, we are training in the neighborhood of 300,000 men in this country to-day under this bill. It is not proposed under compulsory service to train over 400,000, and all we need do is to go on with what we are doing.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. What military training do the young men get who attend the agricultural schools provided for in the Agricultural bill that the gentleman from Tennessee speaks of?

Mr. DENT. That is prescribed by the department, but they must have at least two years.

Mr. BRITTEN. Of military training?

Mr. DENT. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The War Department requires them to have so much training.

Mr. KAHN. And they are trained by officers of the Regular Army detailed by the War Department for that purpose.

Mr. BRITTEN. How much time per week is given to military training?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that.

Mr. DENT. That is a matter of regulation by the War Department.

Mr. EMERSON. Has the gentleman any figures as to how many men would be trained if all the students of the high schools of the country were furnished arms and equipment?

Mr. DENT. And an officer to train them?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I could not give the gentleman the figures, because, as a matter of fact, the War Department, informs us that they have received applications so fast that they have been unable, as the legislation is new, to carry it into operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have estimated for \$50,000 for the young men and boys to be trained in schools, academies, and colleges or universities.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman asked how many there would be if all were trained.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman's question was confined to students in the high schools.

Mr. EMERSON. But I meant in colleges.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But the gentleman did not include colleges in his question. The training of the high-school boys

would not add much to a serviceable army in time of war, because the ages of the high-school boys are from 13 to 17 or 18.

Mr. EMERSON. If we took them at the ages they served in the Civil War, at least half of them in the high school would be available.

Mr. KAHN. I might say for the benefit of the gentleman that there are approximately 900,000 boys every year who attain the age of 19 years and about 600,000 who attend the high-schools.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, when Congress, on March 17, 1916, authorized the President to recruit the Regular Army up to its maximum strength there were in the Army 75,830 enlisted men of the line. On December 31, 1916, there were 84,771 enlisted men of the line. In other words, in a period of over nine months we had gained only 9,000 enlisted men of the line. By the terms of the national-defense act in the present fiscal year, which ends next June, we should properly have 100,083 enlisted men of the line. The second increment of officers and men under the national-defense act will be due in the next fiscal year. We are now appropriating the money to pay the bills. With the second increment added, we are supposed to have in the Regular Army about 120,000 enlisted men of the line; but, as a matter of fact, we are not getting recruits quickly enough to give us anywhere near so many.

It is true that we have been getting recruits more quickly than we have been losing men from the ranks by death, discharge, or otherwise. We must not, however, overlook the fact that to a serious extent this is the result of the device which the War Department has adopted of holding men in the service who under ordinary circumstances would be furloughed to the reserve.

In December—and December and January are about the best enlistment months, I am told—there were 4,372 men enlisted for all branches of the service. Four thousand recruits per month was about the average for the year before last. I think there were about 48,000 enlistments in that year, but that number was exceptionally high.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to ask whether the gentleman knows how many men have been retained beyond the period of contract of service.

Mr. GARDNER. The last I heard, they are all being retained beyond the period of what they thought was their contract of service. Last summer there were called back into the service from the reserve a little less than 3,500 men. By Christmas time, I think, about 3,000 had reported for duty.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I wanted to get at the exact status of the matter.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman say that 4,000 were included in the reenlistment?

Mr. GARDNER. In December, 1916, 4,372 was the total number of enlistments in all branches of the service; that is to say, in the line, Hospital Corps, Quartermaster's Corps, and—

Mr. BRITTEN. What percentage was the first enlistment?

Mr. GARDNER. I can not tell the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, just before election in November there came back to my district from the border three batteries of Field Artillery and three companies of Infantry of the Massachusetts National Guard. We politicians received them with open arms, as you might guess. We had receptions for each one of these batteries and companies. I made six speeches or, to be more accurate, I made the same speech six times, and on each occasion I tried the audience out to see what it thought about compulsory military training. Invariably the response was most enthusiastic and the applause was the most hearty which any of my remarks elicited.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. What was the class of audience that the gentleman had?

Mr. GARDNER. It was composed of enlisted men of the National Guard, of course, and of their uncles, their sisters, their cousins, and their aunts. Of course, there were a few officers and city or town officials. It was a one-sided audience, I admit. I questioned about every returning soldier and officer whom I met. I found that most of them were enthusiastic about the quality of their border training, but here and there I met some National Guard general or other high officer who was convinced that the Regular Army did not know its business. So I went down to the border to find out all I could on my own hook. I went beyond the border. I went down into Mexico.

The Secretary of War was good enough to give me an escort, so I went down to Colonia Dublan to see Gen. Pershing's force of Regulars.

I went down to the border and into Mexico for two purposes. One of my objects was to find out why young men do not more readily enlist in the Regular Army. My other object was to find out the true relation between the National Guard and the Regular Army from the point of view of the junior officers and the enlisted men of the National Guard. I first took up the question of the relation between Regulars and Guardsmen. Before I began I consulted Gen. Bell, who commanded the district of El Paso. I found that on October 7, 1916, an order had been issued by Gen. Funston to all the regular officers who were serving with the National Guard as inspector-instructors or otherwise, directing them to report upon the merits and defects of the National Guard system. That order had been followed by a letter of instruction to the effect that mere criticism was not wanted, but that constructive suggestions were desired. I read over 50 of the reports which were received in reply to that circular order from Gen. Funston. Almost without exception those replies were unfavorable to the National Guard system and its results. I was perfectly well aware that when the mobilization reports were published, and when these other reports were published—and, by the way, so far as I know, these reports have never been published—I knew that at once there would be people saying—as indeed they have been saying—that the Regular Army is trying to destroy the National Guard—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I understand the gentleman to say that the report of these officers has never been published?

Mr. GARDNER. The inspector-instructors' reports have never been published.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. There is a long report—

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is referring to Col. Brown's report, is he not?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the mobilization report. These reports of which I am speaking were made in response to an order of the Department of the South issued on October 7, 1916. I think they have never been published, and, if the gentleman considers the date on which the mobilization report was made, he will see that in the nature of things these reports could not then have been ready for publication.

I knew perfectly well that Regular Army officers were human, that naturally they might have some feeling, being human, because of the amount of praise bestowed on the National Guard and the paucity of praise which we politicians bestow on the Regular Army. I noticed that in some few instances the reports were petulant in tone. But many of those officers I knew personally. Some of them I had worked with. I knew that they honestly meant to report the plain truth. The unanimity of these reports would have struck anyone who was prepared to look at the question with an open mind. I therefore went to Gen. Bell and I said, "General, those reports are going to make a lot of trouble." I told him that there was one thing which I should like to have him do for me. I said, "I know what the generalissimos of the National Guard think of the Regular Army, but I want to know what the enlisted men of the National Guard think of the Regular Army." I got in touch with the Young Men's Christian Association down there. I had interviews with the enlisted men of the National Guard, and I came to the conclusion that their opinion of the Regular Army was entirely different from that of the generalissimos. So I said to Gen. Bell, "I am going to ask you to send out a series of questions to the first sergeants of the National Guard, because the first sergeant, an enlisted man himself, is the buffer between the enlisted man and the commissioned officer." I asked the general whether he would send out to every first sergeant in his command a list of questions which I would prepare. At first he demurred. He said that it was very irregular, that the questions ought to go through the officers. Furthermore, I said, "I wish that those replies might come back to you direct, without passing through the hands of a series of officers." Finally, Gen. Bell said, "I must send out those questions to officers as well as to enlisted men." So he sent them out to all his colonels and to all his captains and to all his first sergeants, with instructions that none of the individuals to whom the questions were sent should consult with anyone else, officer or enlisted man, but should answer in an official envelope mailed direct to the general. There were at that time 16 regiments of National Guardsmen in Gen. Bell's command. There were also 4 independent battalions of Field Artillery or squadrons of Cavalry, making 20 different com-

mands with 20 different commanding officers. There were 296 company commanders and 296 first sergeants, making, in all, 612 officers and enlisted men to whom this list of questions was sent. Gen. Bell received 572 replies.

Here are the questions and answers:

No. 1. Question. Would the instruction of the National Guard proceed more rapidly if more Regular officers and noncommissioned officers were detailed for service with the National Guard?

Answer. Yes: Colonels, 18; captains, 190; first sergeants, 180; total yes, 388. No: Colonels, none; captains, 41; first sergeants, 53; total noes, 94. Conditional: Colonels, 2; captains, 50; first sergeants, 38; total conditional, 90.

NOTE.—The noes were qualified in about half of the replies by the statement that there were "already enough," meaning that one Regular officer and three Regular noncommissioned officers, as at present detailed for the instruction of each regiment, were ample.

No. 2. Question. Are the officers and enlisted men of the National Guard desirous of the instruction from the officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army? If not, what is the reason?

Answer. Yes: Colonels, 16; captains, 217; first sergeants, 205; total yes, 438. No: Colonels, none; captains, 12; first sergeants, 30; total noes, 42. Conditional: colonels, 4; captains, 49; first sergeants, 17; total conditional, 70.

No. 3. Question. Can you suggest any way in which the officers and men of the Regular Army can cooperate more fully with the National Guard in the development of a citizen army?

Answer. The answers to this question may be roughly classified as follows: More cooperation by friendly intercourse and a closer relationship, 122. More careful selection of Regular Army instructors, 28. More instruction from Regular Army, particularly at home stations, 83. Sundry suggestions, 50.

NOTE.—Over 70 replies to question No. 3 desired one Regular officer with each regiment or separate battalion and one noncommissioned officer with each company, instead of only three for the whole regiment.

No. 4. Question. Have you formed any opinion on the question of universal military training? If so, what are your ideas?

Answer. In favor: Colonels, 16; captains, 250; first sergeants, 234; total yes, 500. Against: Colonels, 1; captains, 5; first sergeants, 4; total noes, 10.

No. 5. Any additional remarks you may have to make bearing on the above.

Many of these remarks are most valuable. They will be made a subject of special study at Gen. Bell's headquarters.

Now, some may think perhaps that this classification of the replies is one-sided, but at all events it was intended to be absolutely fair. This classification was made up by Capt. Pratt, one of the finest and most conscientious young officers in the service.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. When the gentleman refers to compulsory military training, does the gentleman mean that a man shall be trained with the option left with him whether he shall serve his country when needed?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; it has always been my idea that the training is really a privilege granted by the Government to each individual. It is in the line of democracy. As to compulsory service in time of war I might agree to that in order to get compulsory military training, but hitherto my inclination has been in favor of voluntary service in time of war. When I was a boy an inspiration came to me from the fact that the veterans I saw around me had voluntarily and not under compulsion offered their services to the country.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman understands a compulsory measure has been proposed by the General Staff and a bill has been introduced in the Senate which not only requires training but compulsory service in time of war?

Mr. GARDNER. I understand that. I shall vote for that bill.

Mr. GORDON. Which one?

Mr. GARDNER. I shall vote for any bill which will compel our young men to get ready to defend their country. I prefer the General Staff bill, if that is what the gentleman meant. I have discussed this matter a good deal in the last two years. Hitherto I have taken the ground that if it looked to me at the outbreak of war as though we could not get a sufficient number of our compulsorily trained young men to volunteer their services, then I should cheerfully vote for conscription; but I preferred not to do so unless it was necessary. However, there is one strong argument in favor of compulsory service in time of war which ought to receive pretty thorough examination. In order to get quick mobilization you must have equipment ready and

transportation arranged for. The individuals to be equipped and transported must know exactly where their own equipment and transportation is to be found. This circumstance would seem to make it imperative that the authorities should know beforehand the names of the individuals whom they could depend upon. Otherwise mobilization must be delayed. But under a volunteer system individuals can not be enrolled long beforehand in the organizations in which they are to serve in war time. The authorities must know beforehand that Jones and Brown and Gardner are going to serve in time of war in order that Jones and Brown and Gardner may have their tickets to their uniforms and equipment and a knowledge of where to report for transportation.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The reason I asked the gentleman that question was because I tried to ascertain from all the authorities who appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs whether there is anything to show that a man who is trained as a soldier, say one who has had such training as the gentleman, myself, and others—whether that training resulted in his responding to the call of his country when he is needed, or whether a compulsory military training inspires a man to respond very quickly. There has been so much talk about universal military training and universal military service I would like to have the gentleman explain upon what he bases his remarks.

Mr. GARDNER. Out of the Civil War draft we finally secured 46,347 men for service, besides substitutes for 73,607 more, in all 119,954 men. Of course, Great Britain has raised the greater part of her army under the voluntary system, and perhaps I might be a little sorry that she did not raise all of it in that way.

There is a feeling abroad that it is not fair for you to take my job while I am doing my duty as a soldier in time of war. Advocates of compulsory service, in time of war, argue that it is wrong that I should risk my life for your protection while you make no sacrifice. I admit the unfairness; but, speaking for myself, I should rather have it so. I should rather fight voluntarily and suffer the unfairness rather than feel that I was fighting because I was compelled to do so.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman think there is anything in the experience of either to show that they would have gotten more soldiers if they had been trained men?

Mr. GARDNER. The British would not have been so much food for cannon if they could have gotten their trained men sooner and put them in the line earlier.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does not the gentleman think that if a man has been marching and tramping around in the mud he is not quite so apt to respond to the call?

Mr. GARDNER. But when he does respond, he is trained.

Mr. KAHN. Both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] speak of the General Staff universal training bill. Have either of the gentlemen seen it?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said the plan that is advocated and the bill that has been introduced by Senator CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. GARDNER. I think that Senator CHAMBERLAIN's bill is based on Capt. Moseley's bill. The ideas of the General Staff are fairly well known. I suppose that they will be incorporated in a bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It is a matter of record in the hearings that Gen. Scott does not believe in any other kind of compulsory military service than that which compels the soldier to go when he is called.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman stated that the British soldiers would have been less food for cannon in the event they had been trained. Has the gentleman got any figures that there have been more British soldiers killed in this war than French soldiers or German soldiers?

Mr. GARDNER. I suppose that not nearly so many British soldiers have been killed. But my point is that until they have had a year's training the British soldiers have not been put in the trenches except when immediate military necessity has absolutely required it. The plan, as I understand it, is that recruits shall be sent for six months at least to the training camps in Great Britain, and then be transported to France. In the last part of the preparatory training period I think that the new officers, without their men, are sent as supernumeraries to the front line of trenches. Many young British officers have been killed before they were ever in a fight—at least so I have been told.

Mr. McKELLAR. My question is, under this compulsory plan in England, have more of the English soldiers been killed than French soldiers or German soldiers?

Mr. GARDNER. I suppose not in actual numbers. I know nothing about the percentages of loss in the different armies.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not this the important thing, that as the result of their not being trained England was not able for nearly a year to put anything like the number of men she needed to do the work?

Mr. GARDNER. Precisely; and when she first sent her new lines to the trenches I understand that it required 10 men for her to maintain the same front which 3 completely trained men could have held.

Mr. McKELLAR. How does the English Army compare to-day with the Armies of Germany and France? One is voluntary and the other is involuntary.

Mr. GARDNER. The English Army is not voluntary at the present moment.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman tell us how they compare with the soldiers from Canada and Australia, who are voluntary soldiers?

Mr. GARDNER. I know nothing about the Australian soldiers, but I know a little about the Canadians. I went to the Canadian camp at Valcartier twice last summer and I heard a good deal of talk. I think they are doing remarkably well. I do not think that Canadians who have had a year's training are showing any substantially different results from British soldiers who have had a year's training. But now, you see, gentlemen, I mean one thing by military training and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] means something entirely different. By military training I mean largely discipline, the yielding of a young man's mind to somebody else. As for this marching up and down in line, I have seen a marching line of young ladies on the stage who would have made Stonewall Jackson's line look as crooked as a ram's horn. These young ladies were splendidly drilled, but they had no discipline. That sort of thing is not military training. That is "hay foot, straw foot." That is the kind of military training you get in your agricultural schools. It is only military drill and it amounts to mighty little. I was chairman of the committee on military affairs in the Massachusetts Legislature.

We have a State agricultural school in Massachusetts, and I used to go up there in my official capacity as chairman. The drill of the students was in charge of a Regular Army officer. They could drill to beat the band; they could execute movements beautiful enough to make your mouth water, but the moment they got their tunics off they were not soldiers trained to obey. That is one of the things which takes time—learning obedience. If you choose to put it that way, it is the breaking of a man's will in the sense that Ulysses S. Grant's will or Robert E. Lee's will was broken at West Point.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Neither of the gentlemen just named, Gen. Grant or Gen. Lee, were ever subjected to compulsory military service.

Mr. GARDNER. No; but they were subjected to West Point training for four years, and that beats anything else in the world.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARDNER. I will.

Mr. GORDON. You are the first intelligent man I have ever known who has undertaken to distinguish between compulsory service and universal military training.

Mr. GARDNER. Last year, in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Hay, I tried to explain the distinction.

Mr. GORDON. What did you say?

Mr. GARDNER. I will find it for you. The colloquy appears on page 4491 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 20, 1916. Now, Mr. Chairman, how much of my time have I exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 26 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to discuss this failure of our young men to enlist in the Regular Army. I want to tell you how I arrived at my ideas—good, bad, or indifferent—on this subject. In the first place, I talked to a great many enlisted men of the National Guard whom I met at home and in the Young Men's Christian Associations on the border. Then, at Fort Bliss I got hold of Chaplain Axton, a chaplain of the Regular Army, and I said, "I want to be put in touch with some noncommissioned officers who have been on recruiting duty. I want to talk with the men who have actually stood on the cold street corners and tried to persuade young men to go into the Regular Army while the Industrial Workers of the World had a sentinel stationed near by trying to get those same young men to stay out of the Regular Army. I have already talked with the commissioned officers who do the office work. I want to talk to the men who actually do the recruiting, and I want to talk to them without their knowing beforehand what I am going to talk to them about."

So the chaplain arranged for me to see a group of the men without their having a chance previously to consult together. I think there were five in the first group I met, all noncoms except one private. All of them had been on recruiting duty. Next I went down to Colonia Dublan, and I asked for a similar opportunity down there. At Colonia Dublan I saw noncoms and privates who had been on recruiting duty. Altogether at El Paso and in Mexico I saw 11 noncoms and privates, and they represented five different organizations. With those 11 men I went as rapidly and as thoroughly as I could into the question of why young men do not enlist in the Regular Army.

They all agreed upon one thing, and that was that the two principal reasons why young men do not enlist are, first, because we do not pay them enough, and, second, because there is too long a contract of service. Young men do not care to mortgage their future so many years ahead. The 11 men with whom I talked did not all agree as to which of these two reasons carries the more weight, but 10 out of the 11 expressed the opinion that the principal cause for the difficulty in getting recruits arises from the fact that we do not pay men enough, and that the second principal cause is the long period of enlistment, or contract of service as it is called. One man out of the eleven felt that the principal cause was the long contract of service and that the second cause was the low pay.

Now, mind you, all these men who were talking to me had been engaged in recruiting at the time when it was supposed that a recruit when he enlisted would serve three years actively with the Regular Army. It was supposed that his fourth year would be served with the colors or with the reserve, as he might choose. The fifth, sixth, and seventh years it was supposed that he would serve solely in the reserve. Unfortunately, the reservists last summer were all called back for active service and that has made a great deal of ill feeling.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Did the gentleman hear anything referring to the mess?

Mr. GARDNER. No; the quality of the food is excellent and the regular cooks are good. There was at first some trouble of the sort in some of the National Guard messes, but that was all straightened out as soon as the cooks had a little experience.

I have given you the evidence of 11 men. I tried honestly to get those men to tell me things which I did not want to hear, just exactly as if I were trying to find out the real political situation in a ward in my district. When I want to know the facts, I do not go into a ward and say, "Everything is going all right, is it not?" If I put the question that way, I should always get the answer, "Sure, Congressman." Probably I might say something like this, "I understand that there is a whole lot of Wilson talk here in this ward." If everything was right, some one would say, "Well, Congressman, I have not heard it." If things were wrong, some one would say, "Well, of course, there are some of the unthinking ones who are talking that way, but they will come around all right by election time." [Laughter.] The only way to get information by asking questions is to lead off with the wrong foot, so to speak. Ask your question as if you wanted to get the answer which you really do not want to get.

I said to these 11 enlisted men, "Tell me all about this caste business between officers and men. When you get down to it, is not there a social snobbishness in these officers that galls the life out of the enlisted men?" Invariably I got the answer, "Oh, no; that is only talk." And, honestly, it surprised me to find them so unanimous on that point. Another reason for nonenlistments, according to my informants, is the amount of heavy nonmilitary manual labor required. They said, for instance, that many of the duties to be performed at Jefferson Barracks, near the city of St. Louis, were not duties which should be required of a soldier. I talked to a noncom who had been having a joint debate about every day with an I. W. W. sentinel outside the recruiting office in St. Louis. The noncom described how he would tell some young fellow for whom he was angling all about the advantages of being a soldier at \$15 a month, with clothing, board, lodging, and medicine thrown in. Perhaps the would-be recruit would say, "Well, that does not seem to be very fine." Then the recruiting noncom would say, "Look at your chance for promotion. Think of it; you might go to West Point in a year and become a commissioned officer." A young man who could scarcely do much more than read and write might not think that was much of an inducement. But perhaps after a while the fish would begin to show signs of taking the bait. By and by an I. W. W. man would get hold of him and say, "Don't you go believing what that soldier is telling you. Do you suppose they mean to make a soldier out of a fellow like you? Not on your life. What they want you for is to do grading out around Jefferson Barracks."

It was quite clear to me that the prospect of this heavy civilian duty is a deterrent to enlistment, even if only to a small degree.

I think this seven-year enlistment period is entirely wrong. A young man of 21 is not anxious to mortgage his existence until he is 28 years old, even if four years of his service is to be passed in the reserve. This year's experience shows that reservists are quite likely to be called back to active service, in many cases to the very great detriment of their family affairs. For the Infantry I should be willing to cut down the term of enlistment to a single year, with perhaps a short service in the reserves. I have not, however, looked into the question as to whether it is practicable to have different periods of enlistment in the different arms of the service.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman think there ought not to be any civilian labor of enlisted men?

Mr. GARDNER. That depends on its nature. Of course, they have got to dig trenches in warfare. There is a good deal of labor by enlisted men that could perfectly well be cut out.

Mr. BORLAND. Under modern conditions of warfare there is a great deal of trench digging and other construction work, is there not?

Mr. GARDNER. I understand; and to the extent that civilian labor is valuable military training it ought to continue, but to the extent that it is merely an economy for Uncle Sam, I am inclined to think that it ought to be stopped.

Mr. BORLAND. That is what I want to get at. Does the gentleman think there is any real evil in compelling soldiers to do what civilian labor they can do around their own barracks and quarters?

Mr. GARDNER. It depends on the nature of the work. Such work as I understand has been done at some of the posts I believe to be a real evil, because it discourages men from enlisting. Mind you, imagination plays a great part in this business of soldiering. Unemployment plays a greater part, of course.

Mr. BORLAND. I am anxious to get the gentleman's idea.

Mr. GARDNER. Here is my idea: The field from which we draw our enlisted men to-day is largely made up of these elements: First, there are the adventurous young men who want to see the world's wheels go round. That is quite a big proportion. Then there are young men who come from the country to the city, expecting to find good jobs on every bush. When they do not find good jobs some take poor jobs and some enlist because they can not find any jobs at all. I think that young men out of work constitute the greatest percentage of our recruits. Then there is a third element, composed of men who, though not out of a job, are tired to death of their own particular job; for instance, a bricklayer who is tired of laying bricks and wants a change. A fourth class is made up of what is known as "snowbirds," men who enlist in cold weather, with every intention of deserting when spring comes. That class is small. The largest class comprises men whose necessities compel them to take \$15 a month and all found, because they do not know where to look for better pay. The second largest class comprises the adventurers. I believe that the adventurous class would be larger if it were not for this heavy civilian labor.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman think we will ever have a really large, efficient Army composed of these snowbirds or other classes he speaks of?

Mr. GARDNER. No; but if we fix a base pay of \$25 a month for privates and have high pay for first sergeants and other noncoms, in my opinion we can raise a really large, efficient Army. If we had a high rate of pay—call it \$75 a month, if you choose, and all found—for first sergeants and other noncoms of high standing, the bill would not be very large; but it would give the recruit a much more attractive picture to look at. A first sergeancy is within any man's power of attainment; but a commission is out of the reach of everyone who has not received a fairly good education. Most recruits realize perfectly well that they never can attain a commission. So the fact that many men rise to commissions from the ranks is no special inducement to enlist, if the man who is considering that step is aware that his education is deficient. On the other hand, high pay for the best noncommissioned places could not fail to please a recruit, even if his education had been neglected. Everyone knows that many an uneducated man makes a prime first sergeant.

Mr. BORLAND. And yet the gentleman would exclude them from doing what they can do, to wit, the civilian labor around the barracks and quarters?

Mr. GARDNER. I should, with limitations.

Mr. BORLAND. Let us take this concrete example: We are being compelled now, under the enlargement of the Army, to enlarge most of the Army posts.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. That involves the expansion of quarters and the building of roads, and a great many other things of that kind around Army posts. Now, does the gentleman think none of that labor should be done by the enlisted men under present conditions?

Mr. GARDNER. As little as possible.

Mr. BORLAND. I can hardly say that I agree to that.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman believe in the Army as a place for vocational training?

Mr. GARDNER. Except on special lines, I am against it, as the Army is now constituted. I am possibly in favor of it in connection with compulsory universal training of the citizen; but even then, if it is adopted, I should want the training period extended far beyond anything now contemplated. For the regular soldier I believe in intensive training. I doubt whether he would care for it, however, at \$15 per month. He has not been getting enough training, and neither have our young line officers, in my opinion. You could get a great deal more intensive training if you had a shorter period of enlistment.

EXHIBIT A.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 26, 1917.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GARDNER: Referring to your letter of the 14th instant, in which you request to be furnished with certain information relative to the enlisted strength of the Army, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

1. The actual enlisted strength of the entire Regular Army on December 31, 1916, based on the best data now obtainable, is approximately 199,959, not including 5,549 enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts.

2. The statutory authorized enlisted strength of the entire Regular Army upon the passage of the joint resolution of March 17, 1916, was 126,956 men, which did not include the then authorized enlisted strength of 5,733 Philippine Scouts.

3 (a). The authorized enlisted strength of the entire Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the provisions of the national-defense act, is 133,133 men, not including the enlisted strength, 5,733, of the Philippine Scouts.

(b). The total number of enlisted men of the entire Regular Army for whom pay is provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the appropriation bill, is 115,200, which number does not include the enlisted strength of the Philippine Scouts, 5,733 men.

Very respectfully,

H. P. McCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT B.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 26, 1917.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GARDNER: Referring to your letter of the 13th instant, in which you request to be furnished with certain information relative to the enlisted strength of the Regular Army, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

1. The actual enlisted strength of the line of the Regular Army on December 31, 1916, based on the best data now obtainable, was approximately 84,771 men.

2. The statutory authorized enlisted strength of the line of the Regular Army as provided by the joint resolution of March 17, 1916, was 103,294 men.

3 (a). The authorized enlisted strength of the line of the Regular Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, as provided by the national-defense act approved June 3, 1916 (first increment included), is 100,083 men.

The figures above given include the strength of the organizations of the line, viz, Infantry, Cavalry, Engineers, and Coast and Field Artillery; but do not include the strength of the miscellaneous organizations composed of men detached from the line, viz, guards at disciplinary barracks, disciplinary companies, recruit companies, school detachments, and unassigned recruits. Under the joint resolution of March 17, 1916, the total number of recruits authorized was 5 per cent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the line, while under the national-defense act it is 7 per cent.

(b). The total number of enlisted men of the line of the Regular Army for whom pay is provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the appropriation bill is 96,424. Included in this number are the men belonging to the miscellaneous organizations (guards at disciplinary barracks, disciplinary companies, recruit companies, unassigned recruits, and school detachments) composed of men detached from the line, but, as before stated, not included in the strength of the line given above.

Very respectfully,

H. P. McCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT C.

	Men.
Total enlisted strength of Regular Army (excluding Philippine Scouts):	
On June 30, 1914 (Rept. of Adjutant General U. S. A., 1914)	87,781
On Dec. 31, 1916 (letter of Adjutant General, U. S. A., to A. P. GARDNER, M. C., Jan. 26, 1917; see Exhibit A above)	109,959
Increase in Regular Army since European war broke out, showing result of preparedness movement.	22,178

EXHIBIT D.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 4, 1915.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In further response to your letter of the 27th ultimo, in which you request to be furnished with any information which would indicate the numbers of northern and southern soldiers who received pecuniary inducements to enlist, either in the form of national bounties, State bounties, or substitute money, and of the number of men who were drafted to serve as soldiers, the number who responded to the draft, and the number who furnished substitutes, I am directed by the Secretary of War to submit for your information the following statement:

SOLDIERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY—NATIONAL BOUNTIES.

In an estimate of the number of men to whom United States bounty has been paid from May 3, 1861, to the end of the war, printed in the final report of the Provost Marshal General (Ex. Doc. No. 1, House of Representatives, 39th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 4), the total number of such men is given as 1,722,690 and the total amount of bounty paid to them as \$300,223,500.

STATE AND LOCAL BOUNTIES.

This department has no data regarding State and local bounties prior to 1863. Such information as the department has been able to obtain from the State and local authorities on the subject is contained in the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series 111, volume 5, pages 740-749.

DRAFTED MEN AND SUBSTITUTES.

The records show that the number of men drafted from the States and Territories during the Civil War under the enrollment act of March 3, 1863, was 716,829, and that this number is accounted for as follows:

Failed to report	161,244
Discharged, quota full	46,101
Discharged by order	47,297
Exempted	315,509
Furnished substitutes	73,607
Paid commutation	86,724
Held to service	46,347

It appears from the above table that 73,607 substitutes were furnished by persons drafted in the Civil War, but no data are in the possession of the department showing the amounts paid to these substitutes.

SOLDIERS OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES ARMY.

Such information as is in the possession of the department in regard to bounties paid to Confederate soldiers has been published in the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series 4, volume 1, pages 825-827, 903, 944, and 1096; volume 2, page 205; volume 3, pages 184 and 1000. From what is there shown it appears that a bounty of \$50 was provided for in an act of the Confederate Congress, approved December 11, 1861, and that in another act approved February 17, 1864, it was provided that at the expiration of six months from April 1, 1864, a bounty of \$100 in 6 per cent Confederate Government bonds was to be paid to every enlisted man then in service, or, in case of his death previous to such payment, to his legal heirs.

The publications hereinbefore referred to are no doubt readily accessible to you in the Library of Congress.

Very respectfully,

HENRY P. McCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am a sincere believer in peace. I am in no sense a militarist. At the same time I am not what is commonly called a pacifist. I believe in preparedness, but I believe in a safe and sane preparedness along lines of common sense, and not that kind of preparedness that comes from fear or military hysteria.

At this time, when apparently we are on the very verge of war, I believe that we should all exercise the greatest conservatism in speech and action, for war is a serious thing, and our country should avoid it if given any honorable way to avoid it. For that reason I am not going to talk on the war situation except to say that I heartily indorse the action of the President in the submarine controversy with Germany, and I stand ready to uphold him and our country all along the line, in peace if we can, and in war if we must. There should be no hesitation and no faltering. We should all be simply unqualified, undiluted, and unterrified Americans. As much as I abhor war, there is but one thing worse, and that is the loss of our national self-respect.

America has a unique position in the world. It is peculiarly situated and has tremendous natural advantages in the way of defense over any European nation, or any eastern nation. Our situation means that if we now or ever hereafter get into a war with any first-class power that it will be a war on the seas. Our Navy must be removed from the seas entirely before we will ever have any use for a land force. We might have 10,000,000 men thoroughly trained and under arms in this country, but we could not move them to any other continent unless we had control of the seas; and I mean by this, unless we had removed all our enemy's ships from the seas.

Under these circumstances, what is our manifest duty on the subject of preparedness? Surely it is not that we should keep a tremendous standing Army on hand at all times at an incalculable cost, which Army we may nor we may not need, and

which we could only use in any event after our Navy had been swept from the seas. Under these circumstances, in my judgment, it is our manifest duty to build up and maintain the greatest Navy in the world. There are a number of reasons why this should be done. Among these are the following:

First. We have built the Panama Canal, and we are obliged to protect it.

Second. We have a great number of island possessions, many of them several thousand miles from our borders, and whether it is a good policy to keep them or not, we are keeping them, and as long as we do keep them it is our duty to protect them.

Third. We have innumerable coast cities of the greatest wealth and large populations, which cities can best be protected by a Navy.

Fourth. The Monroe doctrine is a part of our unwritten Constitution. It is to the best interest of our Nation that this doctrine be upheld and maintained. We would be powerless to uphold and maintain the Monroe doctrine unless we had a great Navy.

Fifth. We have recently authorized the building of a great merchant marine for the purpose of building up our foreign trade. Our private merchant marine has grown up to large proportions recently, and there is no reason why we can not resume our rightful position as ocean carriers; but in order to do so we will be obliged to have a great Navy to protect our merchantmen wherever they go and our citizens wherever they trade.

Sixth. We are now committed to the doctrine of upholding the freedom of the seas.

These reasons are so manifest that it is hard to see how they can be refuted.

Now, what is the condition of our present Navy? I am not an expert in these matters. I understand that at present we do not stand greater than third, Great Britain and Germany both coming ahead of us. However, last year we authorized 157 new war vessels, and I am informed that when the program of last year is completed our Navy will easily be second. After this war is over England, struggling under the greatest national indebtedness she has ever had, and Germany almost, if not wholly, in a condition of bankruptcy, will be unable to go forward with their naval program as heretofore.

On the other hand, the United States is vastly richer than ever before, and she can keep up her present appropriations for our Navy for a generation if she so desires to do. There is no reason why we may not in the near future continue our building program until we have the largest Navy afloat, and, in my judgment, for the reasons above stated, it is our best and cheapest protection, and we should make it first at the earliest practicable moment. [Applause.]

TO DISCUSS CONSCRIPTION.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to-day to discuss only one phase of preparedness, and that is, Should the United States adopt a policy of universal conscripted military service in times of peace?

In approaching this subject I do so with some degree of diffidence in that I am not a professional military man. However, I am not without military training. For four years I was a cadet at a State military institution. For two years I served in the National Guard, and during my service in the House, now more than five years, I have been on the Military Affairs Committee, and in that capacity, taken in connection with my early military training, I feel I have learned something about the military affairs of our country, though in no sense do I claim to be an expert.

CONSCRIPTION PROPAGANDA BORN OF THIS WAR.

Before the beginning of the present European war there were few men in this country, in the Army or out of it, who would hazard the opinion that the United States ought to adopt in times of peace a military conscription program. I use the word "conscription," for that is the real meaning of universal compulsory military training or service. We should not be misled by the use of words.

Since that war began the militarists have been constantly carrying on a propaganda for it, and many newspapers and other periodicals, and other citizens, and especially those from our large coast cities, have given wide publication to these views, and frequently hearty indorsements to them.

In view of our history as a Republic, our Constitution and laws, the wars that we have waged, our protected geographical position, the wonderful adaptability of our people to meet all crises, the predominant belief of our people in personal liberty, our abhorrence of monarchy and militarism, our lack of incentive to wage wars of conquest, and over and above all, our jealous desire to preserve the integrity of our free institutions—it is inconceivable to me how anyone inside or outside of the

Army, even under the stress of great military excitement, such as now exists in the United States and in most of the great nations of the world, could be apprehensive enough or unwise enough to desire to establish in our country a system of military conscription in times of peace. Conscription in times of peace is the dividing line between vassalage and freedom, between monarchy and free government, between autocracy and democracy, between the divine right of kings to govern others and the divine right of men to rule themselves. Wherever we find compulsory military service in times of peace we find castes and classes, we find centralized government in the hands of a few, we find either tyranny or revolution. In other words, we find everything that every true and patriotic American must abhor with all his soul, with all his mind, and with all his might, and with all his heart.

WHAT DOES COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE MEAN?

Compulsory military service means conscription pure and simple. Some militarists of more or less prominence say we should have an Army of at least 3,000,000 men, but preferably eight or nine millions, a portion with the colors and the other portion in reserve; but all ready to be mobilized at a moment's notice. Whom are we imitating if we adopt this plan? We are imitating Russia, Germany, Italy, Austria, Spain, France, and Japan. What are we doing when we agree to imitate them? We are saying that when our forefathers in 1776 and 1789 established a free government in this country they were mistaken; that when they brushed aside all examples of European Governments and started out on a theory that all men were born free and equal and have a right to govern themselves, they were mistaken; and that after 140 years of trial we must forsooth admit our Government has been a failure, and agree to go back to the autocratic and despotic governments of Europe for our guidance and say to them that we have been wrong for 140 years; that we now acknowledge it; and that we are going into a contest with you to see if we can not build up a greater military autocracy than you have ever done.

The militarists are not satisfied with anything less, so they say, than to have seasoned veterans equal to any seasoned veterans of any European nation that may be sent against us in any possible war. Why, Mr. Chairman, if we were to adopt this plan and create an Army in this country of 10,000,000, or even 3,000,000, men in times of peace, it would not be 25 years before this country would be ruled by the most despotic and autocratic militarism that any nation has seen in the history of the world. Even now, with a little Army of a little over 100,000 men, the militarists are seeking to take away the powers of Congress, they are disregarding the mandates of Congress. They are declaring that Congress is not capable of dealing with military subjects. They are losing sight of the first principle of military training—obedience to superior authority. Some of these gentlemen, and I am glad to say for the sake of our country they are few, are openly avowing the incompetency of Congress to deal with the military system of this country. They are openly in rebellion to the higher constituted authority of Congress. They treat with contempt the mandates of Congress, and surely, if they are willing to do this when they have an Army of only 135,000 men, what must the plain people of this country expect when those men, or men who believe as they do, have control of an Army of 8,000,000 men, or even 3,000,000 men?

THE FORMER AND PRESENT CONTENTIONS OF THE MILITARISTS.

The militarists of this country before the outbreak of the European war were always claiming that a large standing army was an insurance against war and an assurance of peace. They were constantly citing the great military establishments of Germany, France, and Russia as being the most effective insurance against war. Of course, we all now know that these great military establishments instead of being an insurance against war were the causes of the greatest war that has ever been known among the children of men. If Germany had never had her great military establishment to back her she never would have declared war against France and Russia. If Russia had never had her great military establishment she would never have mobilized her forces on the German border. What has been the result of these military policies? Why, for example, if Germany should survive, or even if she were to gain all the territory there was in Europe, she would still be loser by reason of the loss of 3,000,000 of her young men, the loss of property, and the loss of her resources especially. Germany can not regain in 200 years what she has lost by this war, which, I believe, is the very result of her intolerable and inhumane system of militarism. The Savior of mankind once said:

For what profiteth a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?

In the loss of 3,000,000 of her young men she has indeed already lost her soul. The same arguments apply with equal force, but in a lesser degree to the other nations of Europe having relatively large standing armies.

So that, confronted with the obvious facts, our militaristic friends can no longer point to Germany, France, Austria, and Russia as the nations whose example we ought to follow in building up a great standing army to insure us against war. God forbid that this Nation, this great free Nation of ours, shall ever follow in the footsteps of European militarism. [Applause.]

THEIR PRESENT CONTENTION.

Their present contention is that while we should not follow the example of Germany and France and other militaristic Governments, yet, because at the end of the present European war our country will be the richest country in the world, as it already is, that it would be easy enough for a great nation like the German, with a great standing army, trained and seasoned, to send that army over here and take our country. I for one have no such fears. If Germany is able to retain her own integrity at the close of this war she will have done well. Her Government and her people will be more in debt than the people of any country ever before. They would be certainly unable, financially, to conduct a war for several generations, and the idea of our building up a great standing army in times of peace by means of conscription to prevent such an attack seems to be a far-fetched and visionary policy indeed.

However, in order to carry out their present views, there are some people in this country who believe, and perhaps very honestly believe, that it is our duty to have conscription in times of peace and create a great centralized standing army thereby. They no longer point to Germany and France as furnishing the systems they would copy, but in order to more easily accomplish their purpose they have sugar-coated the provision by changing the term "conscription in times of peace" to "universal military service," and changing the term "military autocracy" to "democratic obligation of all persons to serve their country."

They at first told us we should copy the Swiss system of compulsory military service, but upon examination they found that that system was not just what they wanted, and then they veered off to the Australian system of conscription, which was just put into force in 1909 or 1910, and has never been tried. Recently, however, their ardor for the Australian system seems to have cooled, and the latest pronouncement was that our militaristic friends have concluded that we should adopt the military system of Argentina in South America! Is not it marvelous that we red-blooded Americans, that we fighting Americans of this great Republic—of this dominating Republic, of this greatest and strongest of all nations—should be called upon to follow in the military footsteps of a South American republic that has in effect neither army nor navy, and who but a short time ago emerged from the despair of revolution! If these suggestions did not come from such high sources, I should not even refer to them, but coming as they do I want to take them up. I have given them all some study, and I will take them up in their order.

THE SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM.

Our militaristic friends in talking about universal conscription formerly invariably suggested the Swiss military system of conscription as the one that we should pattern after. In doing this these gentlemen put themselves in one of two attitudes: Either they did not know what the Swiss military system was or they were not dealing frankly with the American Congress or the American people. There is not one of these gentlemen who would want our country to pattern after such a system as the Swiss system. The Swiss system is precisely the system these gentlemen do not want. They claim that they want a democratic system—one that where there is equality of service, and all are treated alike—rich men and poor men share the common lot. Class distinctions based on wealth or inheritance are for a time abolished, sharing the common service shoulder to shoulder, and so forth. But when they came to look into the Swiss system they found that it was too democratic, because the Swiss system not only conscripts the enlisted men without pay, but it conscripts the noncommissioned officers and commissioned officers without pay in times of peace.

Of course, if the militarists want absolute equality of burden and service, they can not complain if the Government conscripts officers as well as the men.

I do not think that the Swiss system is suitable to our conditions or to our country. I do not believe that their system of conscription of officers is right, nor do I believe that their system of conscription of enlisted men is right. The officers of our Army ought to be paid and the men when they are employed

by the Government ought to be paid. And that is not all; you can depend upon it that they will be paid, whether they are brought into the Army by conscription or as volunteers. This Government will never take the services of its citizens without paying for those services. We might as well look that fact squarely in the face; and whenever we talk about raising an immense standing Army in times of peace by conscription without pay we are talking about a condition that will never exist in this country, and should never exist.

COST OF CONSCRIPTION.

If the country is to have this immense standing army that the militarists would force upon us by universal conscription, then it must be ready to pay the price of that army, and we can depend upon it that the price will never be less than it is at present—about \$1,000 a year for each average soldier. If we have an army of 3,000,000 men drafted into the service under a conscript military law it will cost us \$3,000,000,000 per year, and if we have 10,000,000 men it will cost us \$10,000,000,000 a year, a sum so fabulous that it would take all the earnings of the people excused from Army service to pay for such a system. But, they say, if you do not pay the conscripts the cost will be lessened. It would be lessened by one-sixth. Without pay an army of 3,000,000 would cost \$2,500,000,000.

THE BEGINNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SWISS SYSTEM.

But I was talking about the Swiss system. Switzerland is a little country, not much larger than one of our States—

Mr. QUIN. It is not much bigger than one county, is it?

Mr. McKELLAR (continuing). And not as large as some of them, exceedingly mountainous, having only about 3,000,000 people, and surrounded immediately by four powerful warlike nations—four nations that have conscript military service—Germany, France, Italy, and Austria. This has been her situation for generations. Military conscription in Switzerland has grown up by common consent rather than established by law. Their first compact was in 1393, and since that time, owing to their situation, they have felt that every person should be trained as a soldier. Conscript service was an actual condition before the law was passed providing for it. They have felt that they were obliged to train themselves in order to prevent the aggressive designs of their more powerful neighbors immediately surrounding them.

As a matter of fact, their present military system is patterned after that of the United States. The central government virtually has no standing army at all in times of peace. The Cantons, which are the same as our States, have, except in times of war or threatened war, authority over the military forces. The military instruction and equipment of troops are under the control of the central Government, just as our Government performs a like service for the State National Guard. The organizations under the control and supervision of the Cantons are precisely like our National Guard organizations under the control of the States. The Swiss system is in no sense a national one, except when called into service when war is imminent or when war has been declared. The system is purely a confederative one.

The Swiss Government being poor, it was early found that they could not pay their troops, and, if they were to have an army at all, it must of necessity be a conscripted service. At present they have an army of some 200,000 in active service in times of war and 250,000 in a so-called—but paper—reserve; and yet they have only one general, and only have him in time of war. They pay that general \$3,650 a year when in actual service, and, substantially speaking, he is the only paid officer or man in the army. The entire expenditure of the Swiss Government for military service is only \$7,000,000 a year. In so far as the cost of subsistence and equipment is concerned, the average Swiss soldier costs his Government about \$30 a year. The average American soldier costs our Government over \$1,000 a year. Think of our Army of 135,000 men with only one general!

Mr. SMITH of Michigan rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman excuse me for a moment, and I shall yield later. After I finish my main argument I shall be glad to yield.

It will thus be seen that not only is the Swiss system copied after our National Guard but the only distinguishing characteristic between it and ours is that Switzerland, being a poor country, the services of officers and men are taken by the Government without pay, while our country, being a rich country, takes the services of both officers and men with liberal pay.

It will be noted again that the distinguishing feature of both systems is the concentration of military power in times of danger and the decentralization of military power in times of peace.

A truer military policy was never devised by man. The rock upon which the ship of a republican Government has always foundered in the past was the rock of centralized military power in the nation in times of peace.

The result is, when taunted with the Swiss system, our reply is, We have the Swiss system. But they say that the Swiss system is more democratic than ours. If by that is meant that the officers and men are both placed upon an equality of service under conscription without pay, I say that is true; but when they say that in Switzerland all men have to serve, I say that is not correct. Even in Switzerland not over 25 per cent of the male population bear arms. There can be no such thing in Switzerland or any other country as universal conscription where each male as he arrives at a certain age is required to perform it.

In order for the Swiss system to be exactly like ours we would have to simply add but one small amendment to the national-defense act of June 3, 1916. This amendment is:

That hereafter all officers, noncommissioned and commissioned, and enlisted men shall be drafted into the service of the United States without pay, but with subsistence and equipment, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

If our militaristic friends want democracy of service, equality of obligation of defense, and all the other isms that they have been putting forth lately, this simple amendment will give it to them, and their so-called democracy of service would be complete. Of course, they will not favor such an amendment, nor will I, because I believe that officers and men whose services are demanded by the Government should be paid for by the Government, and, to my mind, it is ridiculous to claim the contrary.

SWISS SYSTEM WHOLLY INADEQUATE.

Again, it is idle to talk about the Swiss system producing an effective army. They are conscripted for so many days for 12 years; or, in other words, between the ages of 20 and 32 years. The infantrymen are required to serve 65 days the first year and 11 days each year thereafter, or 186 days in all. The artillerymen are required to serve 75 days the first year and 11 days each year thereafter, or 196 days in all. The cavalrymen are required to serve 90 days the first year and 11 days each year thereafter, or 211 days in all. In other words, under this conscription system the soldier is trained a little over 6 months during a period of 12 years. I am not a military expert, but any military expert who tells me that you can make a seasoned, hardened soldier by training a man 6 months during a period of 12 years is only making himself ridiculous, and, in my judgment, a citizen thus trained would not be effective for any purpose. Such soldiers are play soldiers. Such armies are toy armies. As compared with our National Guard system our men have to serve 576 hours in 3 years, while the Swiss guardsmen serve only 1,488 hours in 12 years.

In addition, the Swiss system has never really been tried except once, and it was then found wanting. Napoleon went through Switzerland like water through a sieve. Since that time no other nation has ever invaded Switzerland, and I doubt if any has thought of doing so. No other country wants to. It is a mountainous country that offers no advantages to those seeking conquest. Expert Army officers in the United States, including many of those who are in favor of universal conscription, have frequently testified before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House that you can not make an infantryman in less than a year, and that other branches of the service require at least two years. So that we see the much-talked-of Swiss system is only, after all, a weak imitation of our National Guard and wholly unsuited to the military demands of our country and wholly inefficient to bring about a real defense to our Nation.

THE AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM.

For a while our militarist friends were greatly enamored of the Australian military system, and I have investigated that system somewhat and want to tell the House briefly about it.

The Australian system is so new that nobody knows what may come of it. It was only authorized in 1910. Australia has a little more than 4,000,000 people. Her territory is larger than the United States. It is an island, and has more coast than any other country. Her people are nearly all of British origin. It is virtually a white man's country, and in no place in the world, not even perhaps in the southern part of our own country, is the idea of a white man's country more prevalent than it is in Australia. They fear the Japanese very much, and in the last few years they have feared very greatly the growing power of Germany, and especially the menace that lay in Germany's building up a great naval armament. Their idea was that if Germany should at any time catch Great Britain where she could not use all of her sea forces against Germany that Aus-

tralia would be unprotected and that she would fall an easy prey to Germany. This, in addition to the Japanese menace, caused Australia a great fright, and for a number of years she has been considering various methods of protection and defense. She, of course, has no navy and neither has she an army. Doubtless, she has furnished a number of troops to Great Britain in the present war, but even now, substantially speaking, she has no real army. She has adopted a system of compulsory service or conscription which she believes will be of great good, and yet it is untried. It is hardly in working order yet, and instead of being a democratic measure it is the most undemocratic measure that could possibly be imagined.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN has introduced a bill in the Senate which substantially carries the provisions of the Australian system, and in discussing the provisions of that bill, which I now propose to do, the Australian system will be explained. I understand this bill has been changed in some respects and reported favorably. I have not seen the bill as reported.

THE CHAMBERLAIN BILL.

The Chamberlain bill, or Australian system, is quite a remarkable product. It takes every boy in the United States, upon his reaching the age of 12 years, except certain favored classes, and trains him at the expense of the United States Government for a period of 12 years, 6 years as a part of a cadet army and 6 years as a part of the citizen army. This bill would train the boys 90 hours a year for the first 6 years, and 120 hours a year for the next 6 years. This would mean but 6 months of actual training at 8 hours per day, scattered over a period of 12 years. If our Army officers' contention that you can not make a soldier in less than from one to two years is correct, then this training is wholly inadequate and probably would only be a farce.

But this is not the principal objection to this Australian system. Attention only need be called to three exemptions from military service provided for in the bill that destroy the whole so-called democratic idea of conscript service. In the very first section of the bill it is provided, among other exemptions, the following:

- (a) Members of the permanent military or naval forces of the United States.
- (b) Those excused by the President in the interest of the public service by reason of employment therein.
- (c) Temporary exemptions for periods not exceeding one year, and renewals from time to time will be granted to persons whose compelled attendance at the prescribed training would impose great hardships, either by reason of excessive distance or other cause, provided that the district commandant of each training district shall have the power to issue permanent and temporary certificates of exemption for the above-mentioned causes.

These three exemptions are so vicious as even to destroy the idea that the bill might be considered by a free people. The militarists say: "Nothing could be more democratic than compulsory training or service, rich man and poor man alike sharing the common lot. Class distinctions based on wealth and inheritance for a time are absolutely lost." And yet, this bill at the very outset has a provision that exempts every boy who is or who may be so fortunate as to be a member of the permanent military or naval forces of the United States. There are two classes created by the bill, the patricians, or the governing class, and the plebeians, or serf class, the only object of which latter class is to be controlled by the ruling class. If we are to have compulsory service, it should be compulsory alike upon the officer and the man. It should not make fish of one and fowl of the other.

The next exemption offers a very wide field for abuse. It is doubtful whether any President that we might elect would so far forget himself as to allow abuses to arise in connection therewith, but at the same time it offers to the administration of each President the right to build up an unlimited favored class by the use of this power, unless such President be very careful.

The third exemption must be taken in connection with section 17 of the bill, which is as follows:

That each congressional district and the District of Columbia shall constitute a registration and training district, and in each of such districts units of the citizen cadet corps and of the citizen army shall be organized and trained, and for the purpose of registration, organization, and training each of said districts shall be under the charge of an officer of the Regular Army, designated for the purpose, who shall have an office permanently located in the district, and who shall be assisted by the necessary commissioned and enlisted personnel, and by such other assistants as are duly authorized herein as instructors for imparting the prescribed training.

Now, when this section is considered in connection with the third exemption, which provides that the commandant have unlimited power to issue permanent and temporary certificates of exemption for any cause, it requires but a most casual thought for anyone to understand what would be the effect of this pro-

vision. There would be thousands of parents in each congressional district besieging the commandant to exempt their children from the provisions of this bill. All kinds of political influence would be brought to bear upon the commandant by powerful and influential parents to exempt their children from this act, and the immediate result would be, as every man acquainted with politics in this country knows, that an alliance would immediately be formed between the political leaders of each district and the commandant of the district, having for its object the mutual interest of the parties. The local party bosses would work with the commandant to secure two things: First, exemptions for favored parents, and, second, control of the local offices. The commandant would only want to be allowed to name the Congressman and Senators from such district and State, and within a short time after the establishment of such a system there would not be a Congressman in this House who would not bear the stamp of approval of the commandant of his district. The unlimited power to grant exemptions from military service would be a greater power and more effective political power than any ever exercised by a Roman proconsul in the days when the Roman Army was supreme and the Roman Republic was but a name.

Again, section 8 of the bill provides as follows:

That the training prescribed by this act for the citizen cadet corps and for the citizen army and citizen navy may be given in public and private schools, academies, colleges, and universities, in the Organized Militia or Naval Militia of the several States, in organizations of the Boy Scouts or similar organizations, provided that it conforms to the prescribed training for the corresponding years, is of equal annual duration, and is so certified by the district commandant of the district in which such instruction is imparted.

This section divides the citizen cadet corps and the citizen army into two classes, the poor and the rich. The rich who can have their children attend public and private schools, academies, colleges, and universities form one class; the other class are those who are not thus able to be educated, and the latter class, if they do not attend, are arrested and forced to do so with this humane proviso of section 15 of the bill:

That the total duration of confinement of a person in respect to offenses committed in any one year or of costs awarded in proceedings for such offenses shall not exceed 60 days.

In other words the rich would get their children exempted by sending them to the necessary school. The poor would turn their children over to the military authorities or see them sent to jail.

It seems to me that I need not further discuss the provisions of this bill. There are other provisions quite as vicious. It is opposed to every American principle of government. I can not conceive of a military system more undemocratic, more antagonistic to the customs and traditions of our people, or more fraught with danger to the Government itself than this kind of a universal training.

The military commandant of congressional districts would become the proconsuls of the military leaders here in Washington and altogether the militarists would rule this country with a rod of iron. We would have elections, perhaps, just as before, but the political bosses in each congressional district would flock to the standard of the commandant, and no official, either State or National, could be elected without the consent of this military commandant stationed in that congressional district under the provisions of this bill.

Again it would precipitate the race issue in the South and in the far West, because under the provisions of the bill the Negro, the Japanese, and the Chinese would all be trained shoulder to shoulder with the whites. The negro boys and the white boys would serve in the same companies, wear the same clothes, eat at the same tables. To that extent, at least, it might be claimed by those who are partial to the colored races that the bill was democratic.

I next come to the Argentina system, which seems to be the latest fad of the militarists.

THE ARGENTINE SYSTEM.

I quote the following excerpts and statements from a recent history of Argentina:

After a half century, following the 25th of May, 1910, the history of Argentina has a record of wars, revolutions, and other disturbances. It was the unavoidable conflict between centralizationists and autonomists, between military and civil principles of government. (Winter's History of Argentina, p. 321.)

In 1880 they had a great revolution. There was another considerable revolution in 1905 (p. 358), and quite a number of lesser ones in the meantime.

Mr. Winter, on page 400 of his book, says:

It is a mistaken view to think that Argentina is governed by revolution alone. It is true that in the past quarter of a century there have been three more or less serious revolutions, as well as minor disturb-

ances. Two presidents were compelled to resign by these malcontents. As a rule little blood was shed and it was simply their method of introducing a change.

From these it would seem that Argentina, a country more than one-third as large as the United States in territory, and having some seven or eight million people, is a country that has been beset all its life with revolutions. Naturally, it is a very rich country, and but for the revolutions no doubt it would have grown much faster than it has.

It has not now, and never has had, a national army that could insure the Government against the success of the revolutionists. It has a standing army of only 5,000 men, and it has an additional so-called compulsory service army of about 18,000 more.

It has in name a compulsory military service. A recent history of the Republic by Mr. Fraser has this statement on page 81:

There is a compulsory military service. The period of continuous training does not exceed one year, and this only in the case of a proportion of the annual contingent. The others are released after a three months' drill. With varying periods of training every Argentine from the age of 22 to 45 is liable to be called upon to defend his country. Though years may pass without any call to attend military drill, every man in the country must learn to shoot.

As stated above, the standing army of Argentina consists of 5,000 professional soldiers. To this is added 18,000 picked conscripted men, making an army of 23,000 men. Then they have a reserve composed of classes between 21 and 30. The militarists of the United States, who are trying to fasten the Argentine system on us, tell us, in a recent article in *World's Work*, "that in an emergency Argentina can mobilize 180,000 soldiers." As a matter of fact, their army is simply an army on paper. The entire appropriation for military purposes in 1914 was \$13,065,000. The law has been in force only a few years and nobody knows whether it is successful or unsuccessful. They have not had a revolution down there in several years, and the question is still undetermined until the next revolution. As is usual in revolutions in South America, it will be found that about one half of the army is on one side and the other half on the other side when the revolution comes. All the fit men of military age enter training, but after a general training of three months they choose a small percentage by lot to go into the Army.

I am just a little in the dark as to why our militaristic friends desire that the United States should copy a military system of a South American Republic that has in substance no military system except that of revolution. Whether such a system has been suggested in humor or not I am unable to say. Doubtless, however, some of our militaristic friends are inclined to be humorous, and have suggested this system in a spirit of fun. Surely no serious-minded man who knows what kind of a military system they have in Argentina would want the United States to copy such a system. In saying this I do not reflect upon Argentina as a nation. It has the making of a great nation if it ever gets out of the hands of the militarists and revolutionists. Her militarists and revolutionists go hand in hand, and have done more to keep back the progress of that country than all else combined. In the years to come I hope she will get out of the hands of the militarists and revolutionists and take her rightful place among the great nations.

WHAT IS A PROPER MILITARY SYSTEM FOR THE UNITED STATES?

Not even our militaristic friends now claim that we ought to pattern after the military systems of Germany, France, and Russia, which systems, as all men know, have brought such horrible disaster to those three countries in the last three years.

It will be seen from what has been said by me as to the Swiss, Australian, and Argentine systems that it would not do for a great Nation like ours to copy after those systems. The question then arises, What is a proper military system for the United States? My answer to that question is that we should retain our present system. It is a system instituted by the fathers of the Republic. It is a system that has carried us safely through five wars. It is a system under which we have never tasted defeat. It is a system centralized in times of war or the imminence of war when the country is in danger, and after the danger is passed it at once becomes decentralized. It is the system that is in harmony with the history, traditions, and customs of our people. It is a system that gives us protection, and at the same time it is not a menace to our republican institutions. It is truly and purely an American system, and I for one believe with all my heart, with all my soul, and with all my strength that a truly American system is better than German militarism; it is better than Swiss inefficiency; it is better than Australian negativeness; and infinitely better than the systems of South American revolutionism.

As an American citizen, I am proud of our military system and I want to see it built up and made more efficient, so that it will ever be ready to protect America's interests and in times

of peace forever incapable of threatening the integrity of the American Republic.

This system has reached its best stage under the operation of the national-defense act of June 3, 1916. By that act the military forces of our country can be centralized and mobilized upon a week's notice, if the officers of the Regular Establishment are efficient, and constitute an effective defense force. Under it we have a standing army now of 135,000 men. It can be expanded to 225,000 men. We have appropriated money for 135,000 this year. In addition to that, we have a National Guard of 158,000 men. It can be expanded to 400,000 men. This National Guard has just been through a splendid military training on the Mexican border. The two together give us now an effective military force of 293,000 men, and the President has the right under this act to conscript in times of war or threatened war enough men to fill up all National Guard organizations to full strength.

In addition to the above we have rifles and rifle ammunition, field guns and field-gun ammunition, Coast Artillery and coast-artillery ammunition, aircraft and air rifles and ammunition, to equip almost instantly an army of 1,000,000 men, and we have made immense appropriations last year and this year for the purpose of adding to our reserve of arms, ammunition, equipment, and supplies all along the line.

At the same time we are building up a reserve for both the Regular Army and the National Guard. We have doubled the capacity of West Point and Annapolis. We are training every year about 30,000 young men in the land-grant colleges and furnish them with all the paraphernalia with which to make soldiers. Under the national-defense act we have provided a Reserve Officers' Corps in the various schools, colleges, and universities of our country, and it is expected that there will not be less than 50,000 students trained for officers in these various institutions. We have appropriated \$4,385,000 for this purpose in this year's bill. Under the national-defense act the number of students thus trained should at an early time be increased to not less than 200,000 a year.

Again, we are appropriating \$2,500,000 for civilian training camps, and it is claimed that there will be not less than 50,000 men trained in these camps.

Again, we are appropriating \$2,300,000 for target practice and rifle ranges to teach the young men of the country how to shoot.

It will thus be seen that the national-defense act of June 3, 1916, provides for the training of not less than 160,000 of the National Guard, of 50,000 in the Officers' Reserve Corps, of 30,000 young men in the agricultural colleges, and 50,000 in the training camps. In all our Government is now providing for the training each year of 290,000 men. It is only claimed that 400,000 can be trained by conscription. (Gen. Scott, p. 793.)

We are training these men on a volunteer basis. The men who take the training are so situated as to their finances, their dependent families, their employment, their methods and habits of life, that they can thus be trained with least interference to their business pursuits, and surely the annual training of this large number of men will produce in this country within a short time a body of trained military men that will be sufficient to protect our country against any invasion which may come—anywhere it comes from.

In 10 years under this system we will have in this country not less than 2,900,000 trained young men to serve their country in case of need.

In addition to all this we still have the law providing for the call for volunteers, and in a case of necessity these volunteers may be called upon at any time and would come, no doubt, for the most part from these men who have been thus trained in our schools, colleges, and in our military training camps.

In my humble judgment, this system of military training is the very best and most effective training that this country of ours could have, and I am opposed to any change in it, except to build it up and make it stronger and better and more efficient. As an amendment to it I have a bill now reported out from the Committee on Military Affairs, providing for the establishment of national military academies in each State in the Union.

In this connection I want to urge my militaristic friends to leave off complaining of our military system and abusing it, but to join all patriotic citizens in saying a good word for it, and building it up and making it more efficient as the years go by for our common good and protection, at the same time seeing to it that our system shall never become so centralized as to menace the integrity of our Republic.

THE NATIONAL GUARD.

I can not close these remarks without having a few words to say about the National Guard. The national-defense act of June 3, 1916, went into effect a few days before the National Guard was called out. That law provided for pay to the National Guard and was intended to make it, and, in my judgment, does make it, an effective national force. Although it was called out immediately after the passage of the act, the success of the call has been remarkable. In a reasonable time, and, indeed, a shorter time than could have been expected, 158,000 of the National Guard was mobilized on the Mexican border. Up to the time that the National Guard was called to the border there had been frequent incursions upon the part of Mexicans into Texas. While the Regular Army was stationed on the border we had the unfortunate raid upon Columbus, N. Mex., and afterwards came the unfortunate episodes of Parral and Carrizal; but after the National Guard was stationed on the border there was no further trouble. The Mexicans came no more, and now for nearly eight months the National Guard, or a very large portion of it, has been busily engaged in defending the border and in training to make themselves more efficient soldiers.

Notwithstanding the perfect service which they have given, notwithstanding their long and arduous training, notwithstanding their being taken away from their ordinary occupations and deprived of their positions in many cases, these patriotic men have stuck steadfastly to their duty, and in my judgment have rendered to their country a service which every patriotic American citizen should commend and applaud.

However, notwithstanding the fact that the mobilization of the National Guard on the border has been an entire success and has accomplished effectually the purpose for which they were sent there, still our militaristic friends, and I regret to say some of these are in the Regular Army, having made up their minds before the passage of the national-defense act that the National Guard should not be made a national force, have constantly undertaken to find fault with the guard and to criticize it in every conceivable way, and some have gone even so far as to say that it has been a failure. A partially anonymous report was gotten up which casts reflections upon the entire National Guard. In this report, or by whom it was made, or to what organizations it refers, the report itself does not show, mention is made of a number of criticisms of the National Guard. Some of the more important of these criticisms are as follows:

1. The mobilization was not quick enough.
2. That all of the organizations were not up to peace strength.
3. That recruiting was not active enough.
4. There were changes in the points of mobilization after the President's call.
5. There were mistakes made about mobilization camp sites.
6. That the shipments of reserve supplies to mobilization points were not carried on as it should have been.
7. That many of the men did not have clothing, shoes, and extra clothing for the surplus kits.
8. That they did not have the necessary equipment.
9. The transportation was not up to the standard.
10. The necessary horses were not furnished.

Now, it will be seen that each of the foregoing criticisms are really to be directed to the Regular Army organization, because the Regular Army organization under the national-defense act had control of all these matters.

On the other hand, there were some criticisms made that are proper criticisms of the National Guard:

1. The failure of a small part to take the oath as required by law.
2. A great many of the guard were found physically defective and were discharged.
3. Some few of the National Guard failed to respond to the call.
4. Some sought discharges from service on account of dependent relatives and other causes.
5. Some sought discharges on account of being students in educational institutions.
6. Some sought discharges because they were Government employees.
7. Lack of training.
8. Recruiting.

It will thus be seen that to those who are inclined to be critical the mobilization of the National Guard on the border may be criticized. Some of these criticisms apply to the National Guard. Some of them apply just as strongly to the Regular Army. I have no doubt that taken as a whole it has tried to do

its full measure of duty on the border. I believe that the same is true of the National Guard.

To illustrate: They claim that there has been difficulty in recruiting the National Guard, and yet, it is admitted, they have the same trouble in recruiting the Regular Army. It is claimed that they have desertions from the National Guard, but the remarkable fact is the desertions from the National Guard as compared to the desertions from the Regular Army in the same period of time were many less.

All these criticisms about the National Guard not being "first-line" troops are unjustified. The Regular Army men have never been "first-line" troops yet. They have had no more experience as "first-line" troops than the National Guard, and no one knows until they are tested on that "first line" which will make the best. I have no doubt that whenever it comes, should it ever be so unfortunate for either body of troops to be put on the "first line," they will conduct themselves in a manner befitting the American soldier, and both organizations will make real first-line soldiers.

Gentlemen of the committee, we settled our military policy on June 3, 1916. It will not be changed in your day or mine, but, of course, it will be modified from time to time as may be found necessary. It is the very best policy of which this country is capable. That it will be a successful policy in the event of trouble I have no doubt. Under it we can train as many men as it is claimed we can under the so-called military service plan, as heretofore pointed out by me, and I trust that in the future our Army officers, our newspapers, our magazines, and all patriotic American citizens will be willing to stand by this truly American system and give it their loyal, unwavering, and enthusiastic support, and when that is done we can rest assured that the American armies will continue to have that marvelous success in the future that they have always had in the past.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. I have a great deal of confidence in the gentleman's judgment, and I want to ask him if there is any officer of the Military Establishment that came before the gentleman's committee, either at this or the last session, that assures the gentleman's confidence in reference to the reliability of our present system?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say this about it, and I am glad the gentleman asked the question—

Mr. SANFORD. I want the information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give you the information. You take the politicians of the Army, the swivel-chair soldiers, you take the after-dinner calamity howlers, you take the dress-parade gentlemen, in the Army and out of the Army, and they all want a greater dress-parade Army, and they hope to secure it through the way of universal service. Here is what the Secretary of War said before our committee recently, in substance, namely, that he had heard absolutely no criticism of the National Guard from any officer of the Regular Army who was down on the border with troops. Think of it. There was not a scintilla of criticism.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Actually serving with troops.

Mr. McKELLAR. Actually serving with troops. The men who were there, the men who know how to fight, the men on whom this country has to depend when it comes to trouble, make no criticism of the National Guard. They tell you that the National Guard system is a splendid organization. They do not make any complaint of it. But the gentlemen who sit back at home in the offices and at the desks find it easy enough to criticize.

Mr. SANFORD. I want the gentleman to answer my question one way or the other. I do not want the gentleman to think that he has answered it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I have not done so, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. SANFORD. I want to ask if there was any officer of the Military Establishment who has been before the gentleman's committee—and the committee had the right to call all kinds—either at this or last session, that assured the gentleman's confidence in reference to our present system under the National Guard?

Mr. McKELLAR. The only one I recall is Gen. Mann. He said the National Guard had not had a fair trial. We know our office men here. They are all in favor of universal service; but only a very few of them thus testified before our committee.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Gen. Mann was asked if he was willing to say that the system was a failure, and he said that he thought that, considering the fact that there had been no real trial under this system—and I am referring to the National Guard under the national-defense act—he could not say, inas-

much as the system had not been tried yet. That is the substance of it.

Mr. SANFORD. They were universal in condemning it in advance?

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit me, Gen. Mann said that in his opinion the National Guard as provided for in the national defense act had not been given a fair trial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can anybody who has some time give me five minutes more?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment. Some of these officers do say the National Guard has been a failure. They said that before the defense act of 1916 was passed, and their testimony shows that they are simply holding to their former opinions. Let me say in regard to that, in conclusion, that there is no real proof of any such fact. The National Guard has done everything in the world that could be expected of them. They have done everything that has been required of them. You all remember the episode at Columbus, N. Mex.; our National Guard was not there. You all remember the episode at Parral; the National Guard was not there. You all remember the episode at Carrizal; the National Guard was not there. You will remember that before the National Guard was sent to the border there were depredations on the part of Mexicans almost every day or week, but have you heard of any depredations since that National Guard has been there? Not one. They have measured up to everything that was expected of them. They have conducted themselves in such a way down there that in my judgment they have earned the commendation and praise of every fair-minded man in this country for the service that they have done.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. You do not charge the affair at Carrizal to the Regular Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not. It was an unfortunate episode. These things will occur. It might have occurred with the National Guard, but it did not. I am not charging the Regular Army or the National Guard with any derelictions. They are both splendid organizations of men, and I believe that whenever they have a real fight, they will not be found wanting. I say it is the duty of Congress to stand behind these men in the field, to build them up, to make them more efficient, whether they are in the Regular Army or in the National Guard; to build them up along the plans that we have now. I do not believe in criticising them or either of them, and especially at this juncture of our history. I am for a more efficient Army. I would get rid of all this bickering about the Regular Army on the one side, or the National Guard on the other. No patriotic official or officer ought to indulge in such criticism. I think we ought to get rid of it in the Army. I think we ought to get rid of it outside of the Army. We ought to come to the conclusion that there is but one system of militarism in this country, and that is the one that was established by our forefathers, and that one we will stand by and uphold.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KREIDER. I want to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KREIDER. In reference to the Swiss system, which has been referred to so often, do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the Swiss system provides for only 60 days' training?

Mr. McKELLAR. Sixty-five days training the first year and 11 days thereafter for the infantry, 75 days for the cavalry, and 90 days for the artillery during a period of 12 years.

Mr. KAHN. The 65 days is only for the infantry?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; 65 days the first year for the infantry, 75 days for the cavalry, and 90 days for the artillery, and 11 days thereafter each year. It is not anything like the amount of training that is given in the National Guard of your own country. When men talk about the Swiss system being a more efficient system than ours they do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. KREIDER. The 65 days' training is given at the age of 20 years, is it?

Mr. McKELLAR. They get 65 days' training the first year and then thereafter 11 days.

Mr. KREIDER. For how many years?

Mr. McKELLAR. Eleven more years; 12 years in all; and then they do not drill any more.

Mr. KREIDER. Do they have colleges or anything similar to our Military Academy at West Point to train their officers?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have some military schools, of course, but they are not of any great consequence.

Mr. GORDON. It would not be correct to say that that is all the training. They have some training at schools.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. They have some military schools.

Mr. GORDON. No; I mean in their public schools. Furthermore, the Swiss constitution contains an absolute prohibition against a standing army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; absolutely.

But before I close, Mr. Chairman, I desire to add another word about the National Guard.

In closing I desire to quote the words of Secretary Baker on this subject before the Military Affairs Committee of the House:

Secretary BAKER. I think that the call to the border coming inopportunistically, so far as the transition from Organized Militia to National Guard is concerned, has enormously strengthened the National Guard both in its personnel, in its fitness as soldiers, and in its esprit de corps, and I look for very great improvement in the National Guard as a result. (Hearings, p. 725.)

And again:

Secretary BAKER. So far as I know, Senator, no ranking officer who is actually in control of those troops on the border or concerned in their conduct there has made no such criticism.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that. (Hearings, p. 718.)

I am proud of the fact that the real soldiers in the American Army, that the officers who were with the troops in the field, who know the National Guard, have not joined in this condemnation of the guard, and that the only criticisms that come from officers of the Army come from those officers who are far removed from the scenes of any impending conflict, and for the most part are men who have never seen, and who will probably never see, the smoke of battle. Swivel-chair soldiers, political soldiers are ever most critical of those who serve on the fighting line.

The criticisms come, for the most part, from that class of men whom we always have to relegate to the rear when a real conflict comes, the political soldiers, the Miss Nancys in uniforms, the after-dinner calamity howlers, the common scolds of the Army and Navy, the military old maids who see a dozen mice under every strange military bed—these we always have with us except in times of war. But red-blooded Americans need not mind them. Thank God, these fearful ones are few, and when the real conflict comes they all disappear until the war is over, when real men have more time to listen to their carplings. They even criticize those who have fought all our wars from the Revolutionary War down to the Spanish War.

Ah, my friends, it is easy enough years after the event to talk about what an army might have done or what it might not have done. It is easy enough to point out mistakes that have been made, but what we look to and what the world looks to is success. And I say that the American Army has never met a defeat and never will, in my judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I simply ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting some correspondence which I received from Gen. Crozier and from a gentleman by the name Alifas, on the subject of the time study and premium-payment proposition which is involved in this bill, and also the testimony before our committee on that subject. If I can obtain the time later, I will address the House on the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks leave to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BLACKMON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

EXCUSED FROM ROLL CALLS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I was here practically all day yesterday, as I have been during this session of Congress. Late yesterday afternoon I went over to Baltimore to act as best man for a friend of mine, Dr. McKinney, of Memphis, who married there last night. It is one of those services that every gentleman likes to perform for a friend when possible. There was nothing going on in the House when I left that would indicate there would be an all-night session. While I was away last night a point of no quorum was made in the House, and there were six roll calls before midnight. I was paired with Mr. CRAIG, of Pennsylvania, who was present and did not vote; but there was a misunderstanding about his asking that I be excused.

I want to ask of the House unanimous consent that I be excused from the several roll calls under the circumstances, nunc pro tunc.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to be excused nunc pro tunc as of the roll calls of yesterday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a request to be excused nunc pro tunc. I accepted an invitation to make an address on the Government shipping bill, and in discharge of the acceptance of that invitation I was unavoidably absent yesterday afternoon and thereby missed several roll calls. I prefer the same request that was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted. There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 16, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the general deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 2057); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Labor, submitting estimates of appropriations on account of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 2058); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$60,000 for metal storage stacks required in the General Land Office Building (H. Doc. No. 2059); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting additional estimates of appropriations required by the War Department for the service of the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 2060); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, submitting an estimate of appropriation to cover an investigation into the production, ownership, manufacture, storage, and distribution of foodstuffs (H. Doc. No. 2061); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for the relief of John Brodie (H. Doc. No. 2062); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20828) to regulate the conduct of vessels in the ports and waters of the United States in case of actual or threatened war, insurrection, or invasion, or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1496), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAGSDALE, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3680) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1497), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 391) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined post-marking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents, or otherwise, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1498), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19155) granting a pension to James Besheres; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 19469) granting a pension to Alvin Jackson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 20040) to amend the irrigation act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., 1095), section 18, and to amend section 2 of the act of May 11, 1898 (30 Stats., 404); Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (H. R. 20907) to amend an act providing mediation, conciliation, etc., approved July 15, 1913; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 20918) for the relief of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 20919) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Union, Hudson County, State of New Jersey, two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20920) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of West Hoboken, Hudson County, State of New Jersey, two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 507) providing for a referendum vote on a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, supporting the President and the Congress of the United States in whatsoever action he or it may take to preserve the dignity, honor, and safety of our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the preservation of the cabin of Galen Clark, the discoverer of the Mariposa big trees; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, indorsing the stand taken by the President of the United States in the present international crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 20921) for the relief of James Hilliard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 20922) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sidney E. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 20923) granting a pension to Marmaduke R. Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 20924) for the relief of Charles O. Berg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20925) granting an increase of pension to George C. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 20926) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Vanfossen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20927) granting an increase of pension to John W. Vanfossen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20928) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo M. Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20929) granting a pension to Jesse M. Gilliland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20930) granting an increase of pension to Bateman Zoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 20931) granting an increase of pension to Freeman W. Waitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 20932) for the relief of Henry C. Hickman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20933) granting an increase of pension to Pearl Gertrude George; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 20934) granting an increase of pension to Eli House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8051, for special relief of Fred Tish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of George W. H. vos Burgh and 12 other citizens of the city of Columbus, Wis., asking for the passage of House bill 20080, to give effect to the treaty between this country and Canada for the protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers accompanying House bill 20922, for an increase of pension for Mrs. Sidney E. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: Petition of 26 citizens of Catlett, Va., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Telegrams from the Vilter Manufacturing Co.; Roundy, Peckam & Dexter Co.; F. Moyer Boot & Shoe Co.; J. H. Rice & Friedman Co.; Charles A. Clark, chairman banking committee of Credit Men's Association; National Enamelling & Stamp Co.; Pabst Brewing Co.; F. L. Weyenberg, president Weyenberg Shoe Manufacturing Co.; George Ziegler Co.; Rauswer Leavens & Kissinger Co.; Sidenberg & Hays; Phoenix Knitting Works; Richard M. Morowitz; A. C. Jaudell; Russia Fur & Tanning Co.; Goodyear Rubber Co.; Gender Paeschke & Frey Co.; Frank G. Smith, president Milwaukee Credit Men's Association; W. F. Rediske; and the Gem Hammock & Fly Net Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of the Kitchen bill, which restores the old system of charges on collecting checks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of employees of the Post Office Department, urging the passage of House bill 17806, and reclassification bill, Senate bill 7193; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of sundry citizens of the city of St. Louis, Mo., commending the act of the President in severing diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Union League Club, of the city of New York, indorsing recent act of the President of the

United States in severing relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of T. K. Rowen, of Ocean Grove, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Christadelphians, praying for exemption from all forms of military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., approving recent act of the President of the United States in severing relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Knox Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Cal., for the passage of a bill to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Knox Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Cal., for the passage of a bill to prevent advertising of, and soliciting for, sale of alcoholic liquor by mail in prohibition territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Memorial adopted at a mass meeting of organized labor protesting against war and asking a referendum vote before war is declared by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 54 people of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Genoa, Ill., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, indorsing the action of the President in severing diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, relative to the separation of the Long Island Sound steamships from the control of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dorchester and Boston, Mass., favoring a retirement law and an increase of salary for letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Haverhill, and Newton, all in the State of Massachusetts, urging that the people be consulted by referendum before Congress declares war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the New York Association for the Protection of Game, favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial adopted by the Union League Club of New York, indorsing the recent act of the President in severing diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of William F. Eldredge and other residents of Rockport, Mass., urging passage of House bill 20080, known as the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial adopted by citizens of the city of San Jose, county of Santa Clara, Cal., asking investigation of labor conditions at Everett, Wash.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany House bill 20926, to increase pension of Benjamin Vanfossen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 20927, to increase pension of John W. Vanfossen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 20429, granting increase of pension to Charles E. Spear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 20928, to increase pension of Alonzo M. Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Leo Luedtke and 22 other citizens of Tawas City, Mich., relative to declaration of war only by referendum vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Mrs. Edward A. Jones, president of the Congress of Women's Clubs of Western Pennsylvania, relative to Congress indorsing the movement of the Bureau of Naturalization and the public-school authorities in the work of educating the alien; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTEN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, relative to Americans keeping out of the danger zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and New York, N. Y., opposing mail-exclusion and prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Miss Jean W. Simpson, New York, N. Y., favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Louise Merritt, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the American Forestry Association, Washington, D. C., favoring legislation to eradicate the pine-blister disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Memorials adopted by the Masons and Bricklayers' Union No. 8, of Milwaukee, protesting against a declaration of war against Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Women's Clubs of Western Pennsylvania, in support of Senate bill No. 7909; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Boston Gaelic School Society, against enacting any law abridging the rights and liberties of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of Lorin Schantz and 14 residents of Highland, N. Y., opposing mail-exclusion and prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. J. Depuy and other residents of Wurtsboro, N. Y., for the submission to the States of a national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 125 people of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Clintondale, N. Y., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 220 people of the Friends' Church, Clintondale, N. Y., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEY: Petitions of sundry citizens and church organizations of South Carolina, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 16, 1917.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 10.30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Stone
Bankhead	Hughes	Oliver	Sutherland
Brady	Husting	Overman	Swanson
Bryan	James	Owen	Thomas
Cañon	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thompson
Chamberlain	Jones	Poin Dexter	Tillman
Clapp	Kenyon	Ransdell	Townsend
Colt	Kirby	Robinson	Vardaman
Culberson	La Follette	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Shafer	Walsh
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Warren
Fernald	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Fletcher	McCumber	Shields	Williams
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	
Hitchcock	Myers	Smoot	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

GOVERNMENT OF PORTO RICO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement. I send it to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 1 o'clock on Saturday, February 17, 1917, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9533, a bill to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, and during that day shall vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 1 o'clock on the 17th day of February, 1917, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than five minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted a word, the bill, I understand, is substantially completed. It is a very important bill and ought to pass; but there is pending to it a